

EMPIRE CLUB
SPEECHES
1940-41





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
University of Toronto



HON. G. HOWARD FERGUSON, P.C. CAN., K.C.
PRESIDENT OF THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA, 1940-41

THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

ADDRESSES DELIVERED TO THE
MEMBERS DURING THE
YEAR 1940-41

Thirty-eighth Year of Issue



GOD SAVE THE KING

T. H. BEST PRINTING CO., LIMITED
TORONTO, ONT.

Copyright, Canada, 1941
The Empire Club of Canada

PRINTED IN CANADA
T. H. BEST PRINTING CO., LIMITED
TORONTO, ONT.

“OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE”

Year 1940-41

FIELD MARSHAL H. R. H. THE DUKE OF CONNAUGHT
AND STRATHERN, K.G., G.C.M.G.

Honorary President:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE RIGHT HONOURABLE THE
EARL OF ATHLONE, K.G., G.C.B., G.C.M.G., G.C.V.O.,
D.S.O., V.D., GOVERNOR-GENERAL OF CANADA.

President: THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON, P.C. (Can.)
K.C.

First Vice-President: C. R. SANDERSON, ESQ., M.A., B.Sc.

Second Vice-President: H. F. POWELL, ESQ.

Third Vice-President: E. F. THOMPSON, ESQ.

Honorary Secretary-Treasurer: H. C. BOURLIER, ESQ.

Assistant Treasurer: W. W. COMBER, ESQ.

Honorary Auditor: H. T. JAMIESON, ESQ.

Executive Committee:

H. H. BISHOP, ESQ.

F. L. CLOUSE ESQ.

F. B. FETHERSTONHAUGH, ESQ., K.C.

G. O. FLEMING, ESQ.

ROBT. FLEMING, ESQ.

HORACE HARPHAM, ESQ.

W. EASON HUMPHREYS, ESQ.

A. T. HUNT, ESQ.

J. C. M. MACBETH, ESQ., K.C.

F. HEDLEY MARSH, ESQ.

DENTON MASSEY, ESQ., M.P.

LEONARD L. McMURRAY, ESQ.

J. P. PRATT, ESQ., K.C.

FRANK PULLEN, ESQ.

A. ROSS ROBERTSON, ESQ.

J. D. SPENCE, ESQ., K.C.

R. A. STAPELLS, ESQ.

Immediate Past President: F. A. GABY, ESQ., B.A.Sc., D.Sc.

Past Presidents:

BRIG. GEN. C. H. MITCHELL, C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O.

SIR WM. HEARST, K.C.

ELLIS H. WILKINSON, ESQ.

THE ROYAL EMPIRE SOCIETY
AND
THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

The Royal Empire Society of London, England, and the Empire Club of Canada at Toronto were both founded for a single purpose and with a common aim;—the strengthening of the bonds of unity within the Empire. This mutual objective is prosecuted with vigorous enthusiasm by the members of these organizations on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - - - - -	v
ADDRESSES:	
SAVE OUR TIMBER AND FOREST INDUSTRIES - - - - - HON. FRANK CARREL, LL.D.	1
THE PRESENT CHALLENGE TO CANADA - - - - - HON. NORMAN MCLEOD ROGERS, M.A., B.Litt., B.C.L.	19 ✓
THE BLITZKRIEG IN FLANDERS - - - - - GREGORY CLARK	33 ✓
CANADA AT WAR - - - - - HON. C. D. HOWE, B.Sc., M.E.I.C.	50 ✓
AUSTRALIA - - - - - MAJOR-GENERAL THE HONOURABLE SIR THOMAS WILLIAM GLASGOW, K.C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O., V.D.	70
THE OLD COUNTRY CARRIES ON - - - - - SIR EVELYN WRENCH, C.M.G.	81
CANADA'S DESTINY - - - - - HON. G. HOWARD FERGUSON, K.C.	97 ✓
A BATTALION COMMANDER'S EXPERIENCE IN THE FIRST YEAR OF THE WAR - - - - - BRIGADIER ERIC W. HALDENBY, M.C., V.D.	112
YESTERDAY AND TO-DAY IN AMERICA - - - - - VICTOR GOGGIN	129
THE TWENTIETH CENTURY CRUSADE AT HOME AND ABROAD - JOHN COLLINGWOOD READE	148
THE WAR AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR CANADA AND THE EMPIRE - - - - - SIR HOWARD D'EGVILLE, K.B.E., LL.D.	158
WINGED WARFARE OVER BRITAIN - - - - - AIR MARSHAL WILLIAM A. BISHOP, V.C., D.S.O., (with Bar), M.C., D.F.C.	167 ✓

	PAGE
THE INVASION OF NORWAY - - - - - CAPTAIN HJALMAR RIISER-LARSEN, R.N.N.	179
CLOSE TO THE WAR - - - - - PERCY JAMES PHILIP	193
EDUCATION AND THE EMPIRE - - - - - HON. DUNCAN MCARTHUR, M.A., LL.D.	212
QUEBEC AND PAN-CANADIAN UNITY - - - - - HON. JOSEPH ADÉLARD GODBOUT, B.A., B.S.A., D.A., LL.D.	225
THE DIFFICULTIES OF THE AXIS - - - - - EDGAR W. MCINNIS, M.A.	243
HISTORY OF CHRISTMAS MUSIC - - - - - HEALEY WILLAN, MUS.D., F.R.C.O.	257
EMBATTLED BRITAIN - - - - - EDWIN S. JONSON	266
THE RAPE OF NORWAY - - - - - HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS CROWN PRINCE OLAV OF NORWAY	280
ADDRESS - - - - - HIS EXCELLENCY THE RIGHT HONOURABLE THE EARL OF ATHLONE, K.G., G.C.B., G.C.M.G., G.C.V.O., D.S.O., A.D.C.	298
THE EMPIRE AT WAR IN THE MOSLEM MEDITERRANEAN - TRACY PHILIPPS, M.C., D.C.L. (Hon.)	309
INFLATION AND WAR FINANCE - - - - - F. CYRIL JAMES, B.COM., M.A., PH.D.	322
INDO-CHINA AND THE JAPANESE - - - - - DR. JACQUES M. MAY	342
CANADA IN CRISIS—AS SEEN BY AN AUSTRALIAN - - - REV. FREDERICK W. NORWOOD, D.D.	356
THERE ARE NO CIVILIANS IN LONDON - - - - - MRS. MARCUS DIMSDALE	370
CANADA AT THE CROSSROADS - - - - - LIEUTENANT-COLONEL GEORGE A. DREW, K.C., M.L.A.	385
WHAT IS NOW AT STAKE IN EUROPE - - - - - HERBERT L. STEWART, M.A., PH.D., F.R.S.C.	402

CONTENTS—*Cont'd.*

ix

PAGE

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF SOUTH AMERICAN TO CANADA	- -	419
DR. JOHN R. MOTT		
ANGLO-AMERICAN RESPONSIBILITIES	- - - - -	438
MAX W. BALL, F.G.S.A.		
TWO THOUSAND YEARS OF DEMOCRACY	- - - - -	456
HENRY PETERSON		
OFF THE RECORD	- - - - -	470
COLONEL W. J. DONOVAN		
SALUTE TO BRITAIN	- - - - -	481
HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL J. M. RODRIQUE VILLENEUVE, O.M.I., D.D., D.D.C., D. PH.		
MUNITIONS AND MORE MUNITIONS	- - - - -	495
HON. C. D. HOWE, B.Sc., M.E.I.C.		
ANNUAL MEETING	- - - - -	509
ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT	- - - - -	513
HONORARY AND PAST PRESIDENTS	- - - - -	514
OFFICERS AND COMMITTEE—YEAR 1941-42	- - - - -	515
CONSTITUTION	- - - - -	516
MEMBERS WITH HIS MAJESTY'S FORCES ON ACTIVE SERVICE		521
LIFE AND HONORARY MEMBERS	- - - - -	521
NON-RESIDENT MEMBERS	- - - - -	521
RESIDENT MEMBERS	- - - - -	522

THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

"SAVE OUR TIMBER AND FOREST INDUSTRIES"

AN ADDRESS BY

THE HONOURABLE FRANK CARREL, LL.D.

Chairman: The President, Dr. F. A. Gaby.

Thursday, May 30, 1940

DR. F. A. GABY: Gentlemen: We are greatly honoured to-day in having with us a distinguished member of the newspaper profession, and an honoured member of the Legislative Council of the Province of Quebec. This is the second occasion on which we have been favoured by members of the Government of this province. You will recall that last Fall the Honourable Mr. Mathewson, Provincial Treasurer of Quebec, addressed the Club, and to-day we have a member of the Upper House as our guest-speaker.

Although these are serious times and most of us are interested in the acceleration of our war effort, nevertheless we must look forward to that time when it will be necessary to proceed with the normal functions of our industry.

The subject of our guest-speaker's address to-day is "Save Our Timber and Forest Industries", and is, I understand, the third or fourth of a series of articles which are in sequence, dealing with this most important subject. Mr. Carrel has spent a great deal of his life in the study of this important problem and we are indeed honoured in having him with us.

I have much pleasure in introducing the Honourable Frank Carrel.

THE HONOURABLE FRANK CARREL, LL.D.: (The following remarks were addressed to the radio audience.) To those who listen in to my address may I say that in the terrific struggle which is going on in Europe to-day many of our gallant boys are overseas to fight in the defence of Canada and Canadians. Good luck to them and God bless them! To those of us who are unable to join, we have a duty to perform in their absence. We must strive our utmost to prepare jobs for our heroes when they return from Berlin.

Kindly bear these thoughts in mind as you listen to my address.

Mr. President and Gentlemen: It is now several years since I had the honour of addressing your Club.

I spoke then of my efforts to organize an Empire Economic League in Britain. My object at the time was to found an Empire organization that could imperially, and without political partisanship and the danger of government interference, discuss and study our economic problems. Furthermore, its services would be of aid and assistance to all governments of the Empire, irrespective of political persuasions.

Our present set-up, under democratic governments, in and out of office at the will of a sensitive electorate, is not conducive to permanent Empire industrial and economic solidarity. Trade and commerce of the Empire must rest upon a solid foundation of non-partisan political influences if we want to participate in its full benefits.

To establish an Empire economic organization to carry on research work in the development of our natural resources, which would compare favourably with that existing in Washington, Berlin and Japan, would be of incalculable service to our export trade.

Canada and every part of the Empire is suffering from the lack of such a body. Our parliamentary representatives, desirous of helping our forests and forest industries are handicapped by this economic shortcoming.

During the past months I have sought information of

our trade organizations and our governments but with only partial success. In consequence, I was forced to go to Washington where the courtesy of the officials is one of the strongest signs that the Americans no doubt want to help us in our foreign trade expansion. I am sure they realize that in aiding our commercial efforts they are participating in our success by the large amount of goods we buy from them.

Through this Empire economic organization we desired to institute a weekly radio résumé of the Empire's natural resources and the very latest information pertaining to their development. These trade talks we believed would enlighten, interest and enthuse our business men in every corner of the Empire. They would lead to many contacts of commercial expansion of ideas, plans and policies from which we would all benefit. They would go further. They would lead to a survey of the world's commercial progress and from the information and material gathered our governments would be fully informed and able to take a long-range view of our economic development upon which to shape their policies and legislation.

From this organization I believe we would have been able to obtain a new perspective of beneficial co-ordination of Empire trade. For instance, Quebec possesses the greatest production of maple products in the world, and yet, due to ignorance or other reasons, we are unable, satisfactorily, to market these delicious products—the healthiest and purest of all world foodstuffs. In dollars and cents we are selling less of these products to-day than we did fifteen years ago. What a commercial reflection when we realize that millions of dollars worth of European chocolates are sold on this continent, made by enterprising manufacturers of European nations, out of raw materials not indigenous to the centres of manufacture. Another advantage of the maple sugar industry is in the fact that the smallest farmer can make the basic substance.

No one knows what will happen in Europe after the present war. Would it not have been opportune to have possessed an organization which could guide and aid us in

preparation to carry on the responsibilities of commerce which may develop from a catastrophe of untold destruction to European industry?

With an Empire Economic League we would be able to regulate in an orderly and profitable manner, a new conception of Empire trade on a broad, mutual, co-operative plan.

For illustration: An Empire survey of our natural resources would reveal what each part of the Empire could best produce in wheat, cattle, fruit, vegetables, lumber, newsprint, metals, ores, coal, oils, etc., etc.

Each Dominion would strive to contribute the highest quality of products at the lowest possible prices to the world's markets. It would foster an economic body of integral parts in a great expansive development of specialties of natural resources which, if economically developed and managed, would protect the Empire against much of the world's competition.

My campaign aroused great interest in the United Kingdom. It received favourable comment from the entire press, but it also aroused a jealousy on the part of existing trade associations, who thought they possessed the necessary machinery for the accomplishment of my objective, which, of course, was not the case. This temporarily retarded the consummation of the movement.

I had the satisfaction however, of seeing my plan debated in the House of Lords. I think I am probably the only Canadian urging a plan for increased trade within the Empire, who received such an honour.

The campaign was not a failure. It sowed the seed of a new thought. The missionary work was effective. The realization may materialize in years to come like a bolt out of a blue sky.

In the meantime, our efforts have caused many to think that in our democratic system of government, we must separate business, trade and commerce from the disastrous control and influence of partisan politics. I believe my work has done much good, particularly in convincing a

following that there is grave danger of our present position creating fertile soil for all the European "isms".

To-day I come before you fighting in an effort to help save our forests and our forest industries by removing them from political partisan influences which I believe is one of the causes which have brought such a harrowing burden upon our investors and those connected with the administration of these natural resources. If we can succeed in our objective we will not only save our industries but conserve our forest growths in perpetuity. To accomplish this task we must arouse public opinion to the seriousness of the situation through publicity and education.

What do I mean by this statement? Let me be more explicit, with no sense of criticism. A few weeks ago, in my native city, a high official of the pulp and paper industry made a speech at a convention. His text covered, principally, a comparative statement of the exports of the pulp and paper industry between the years 1913 and 1939. The concluding figures were colossal, reaching a net of \$155,000,000. Anyone reading this speech and noting these figures would naturally believe that the pulp and paper industry must be making fabulous profits though this was not exactly stated in the speech. Such statements might lead to strikes and discontent among our workers, and disappointment and prejudice among our investors. Nor was it mentioned that our mills, a short time ago were running only at 50 per cent to 60 per cent capacity; that many of our companies had gone into bankruptcy; that thousands of investors had lost their complete savings, in some cases without reason or judgment; that many more thousands were patiently waiting for interest or dividends; that our forests were being wantonly depleted; that foreign competition had entered our best markets and was decreasing our sales; that a new competitive opposition was rising in the Southern States; that the war was only a temporary stimulant to this industry and that we would be back in our old positions when it was over, unless—and here is the important point—our people are aroused to

united action through a knowledge of the truth in order to force our Governments, both Federal and Provincial, to throw off the shackles of partisan politics, exploitation and selfish interests.

Unless this is done the worst is yet to come.

It will be too late when our mills begin to die a natural death, our villages and towns empty of their populations or become derelict burdens on the state, and our people discouraged, but, gentlemen, that is the true outlook—if our Governments do not awaken to our critical condition and come to our rescue with the financial resources of the country. They must act to-day because it will be too late if they wait until to-morrow.

A short time ago one of the leading officials of our pulp and paper industry, in the course of giving evidence at the Ontario Provincial inquiry, stated that he was in favour of pro-ration and outlined what it had done for the industry in Canada.

All of which was impressive and apparently conclusive evidence of the success of pro-ration. What he did not say, however, was that pro-ration is probably a good temporary controlling influence though economically I think it is very much like monetary inflation which stimulates business for a time, but in the end is not so healthy.

There is not a financial magnate in the world to-day who does not shudder at the thought of monetary inflation because he is afraid of the after-effects.

So I think it is with pro-ration. However, this is not the point at the moment. The public should be informed that pro-ration is not uniformly applied in Canada and that this is one of its present weaknesses. For instance, we have pro-ration in Quebec and Ontario with special exemptions to several of our mills, which is naturally unfair not only to the rest of the mills in our province, but unfair to our customers to whom we are selling newsprint from other mills.

But pro-ration not being applied in the other provinces of the Dominion we see a group of investors owning a mill in Quebec or Ontario subject to pro-ration and other

groups owning mills in other provinces with no such restrictions.

Are regulations of this kind not leading us into the very dangers we are trying to avoid? Are these restrictions, off and on, at the will of a partisan political government, not responsible for our troubles to-day and what is still worse, those which we may expect to-morrow?

We also have a government regulation in Quebec which prohibits the export of pulpwood from Crown Lands, but in the Province of Ontario it is legally permitted and even encouraged to the extent of over half a million cords per annum. The Ontario Government has announced that some of their operating mills should be closed while at the same time the Province of Quebec is announcing that they must re-open some of their closed mills.

Do you, as a sensible body of men, not think that this is a ridiculous anomaly? If Ontario and Quebec and the other provinces cannot get together in influencing uniform legislation, is it any wonder that we are criticized, and justly so, in the administration of one of the richest resources of our land.

It does not matter upon which government we must place the responsibilities for our present conditions, but I say that unless we know the truth, we, the public, cannot come to the assistance of this industry as we desire to do.

To-day our students are becoming interested. I believe they will become a force in helping us. It is a promising sign to have our young people take an interest in our economic questions. It is our lack of vision and interest in this respect which is sowing the seed of mental unrest in many of our educational institutions.

We Canadians, in a new country, blessed, or is it cursed, with an over-abundance of one of the greatest natural resources in the world, have been prodigal—may I go further and say wasteful and negligent—in observing the first rules of economic thrift in the administration of our rich inheritance.

We have such a super-abundance that we waste it. We have not yet realized what economic zones mean, that our

newsprint mills can only operate profitably with cheap raw material from the forests near the mills. Cut these nearby forests indiscriminately and we raise the cost of the raw material—we create high cost competitive mills.

We must put our house in order and avoid the pitfalls of the past by charting a new economic course for the future. The time has arrived when we have to place our cards on the table. We are approaching a dangerous decade. We are running into serious competition in our natural markets in the United States. Blinding our people is not a remedy.

Foreign nations are beating us in the price of our products. We must learn how they are doing it and we must courageously meet the competition at all sacrifices. Governments, investors and workers must join together to meet this industrial menace. We cannot stand by and look on when there is yet hope to make a stout resistance, for we have every aid of Nature on our side.

We have the benefit of our vast forests, swift running rivers to carry our logs to the mills, water and rail transportation to convey our products to their natural markets and abundant electrical power to drive our machinery.

Flowing through our immense forest lands, rich beyond any other country in the world, is our majestic river, the St. Lawrence, over which to carry our merchandise, without use of rail and transshipment expenses, on its way to all corners of the universe.

With all these advantages surely we should be able to solve our present handicaps and meet the competition of any nation in our neighbouring markets. Will we do it? I think we will, in fact we *must*!

Slowly but surely this competition is growing into a menace which must be faced with our best brains.

The first step towards meeting this competition is in the enlightenment of our people. The next is to relieve our forests and forest industries from partisan political influence and place them under an independent commission of our best practical men, men who possess the necessary scientific knowledge to find a cure for our ailments.

If not, the results may be disastrous.

I have introduced a motion in the Quebec Legislative Council to this effect. It calls for a permanent advisory commission or council of our practical experts to make a complete survey and research in order to counsel our Governments, both Federal and Provincial, in policies that will aid our manufacturers to meet this coming competition.

We lack unity of effort and co-ordination in effecting necessary economies which may not have been necessary years ago but which are imperative to-day. We must organize throughout Canada, uniform regulations and understandings on modern conservation methods, sane labour arrangements, stumpage dues and taxes, and break down the barriers now impeding the cost of our forest products.

The ignorance of our people concerning present day conditions in the development of these natural resources is lamentable. Let us make our people forest-minded. Let us show them how we are being beaten in foreign markets notwithstanding all that Nature has done for us. Let us tell our youth of these facts through our schools, colleges and universities and enlist them in our missionary work.

Let us tell them how Japan is building up her forests through reforestation. A Japanese cannot cut down a tree without planting two new ones. Let us tell them that in the Scandinavian nations a tree cannot be cut down without a government permit. Let us find out how the Scandinavian mills can buy electric power for five dollars a horse power when our manufacturers have to pay three and four times as much. Let us tell them of the small wood dues in Finland, Norway and Sweden as compared with our heavy charges in Canada. Let us tell them how our Governments are charging our forest industry in dues which are used to carry on extravagant expenditures which bring us no return—to the sacrifice of one industry that brings returns.

In the Province of Quebec the Government collects over \$7,000,000 from the forests and spends \$2,500,000 of this amount on forest administration with practically

nothing on conservation. It may be the same in other provinces. Is this fair, under the circumstances? I think it is deplorable.

The United States Government has spent over \$3,500,000,000 in the past eight years in aiding the conservation, development and protection of her forests—billions more than it is collecting in dues or taxation from its forest industries. Is it any wonder that the United States is bringing larger forest areas under proper management, for in so doing they will eventually produce sufficient raw material for their mills within economic zones.

What will happen when they have sufficient for their home consumption? Where will we find other markets? Not in Australia, New Zealand, Tasmania, China, India or Japan, for they are building mills in these countries.

They are making newsprint out of almost all varieties of trees, rice grass, bamboo and other indigenous growths.

No, we have arrived at a period in the history of our forest industries when we must set our technicians, technologists, chemists and all experts to intensive study so that we may produce continuous forest crops and find other outlets for our forest products. Our Federal Government must increase its present insignificant subsidy to aid in this work. Instead of the small sum of \$300,000 they must increase it to many millions.

Our Federal Government votes \$9,000,000 for Agriculture; \$3,000,000 for Mines; \$1,700,000 for Fisheries; and only \$300,000 for its Forests. The total of these subsidies for aiding Agriculture, Mines, Fisheries and Forests, the principal sources of all Canada's revenues, is less than \$15,000,000 and yet we are spending \$40,000,000 to \$50,000,000 every year to pay the deficits of one railroad in our country, not to speak of the many millions we spend in bonusing our wheat crops.

We may well ask ourselves if we are using our best administrative judgment in these matters. Can we find such weaknesses in dictatorial nations with which we have

to compete? These gaps in our industrial life should be bridged over.

We must realize that it would be better to see a wave of economic optimism sweeping over Canada and the Empire than to wait for a dictator to arrive and endeavour to check our waste of national resources by force rather than by peaceful persuasion.

We abhor the brutal conditions of dictator governments in Europe to-day. At the same time we are apprehensive of the growing danger of European propaganda on this continent. We must make a choice in the immediate future concerning the separation of our economic questions from partisan political influences; if not we will drift into another form of government which may remove some of our present day liberties which are the salvation of our Empire.

"Keep the farmer on the land" is a good slogan but to do it we must provide him with a decent living. Permitting him to cut down all his trees and sell them in one or two seasons is not conducive to promoting national economy.

Until last September when war was declared, we were shipping hundreds of thousands of cords of pulpwood from the banks of the St. Lawrence below Quebec, to Germany. Much of this wood was manufactured into woodpulp and newsprint and sold in the United States and elsewhere, in competition with our own product. This wood was purchased by German agents and loaded in German ships, paying low German wages. This wood was bought from our farmers under no government restrictions or regulations. It did not represent the annual growth—it represented in too many cases the whole forest stand of some farms—the valuable source of annual income to our farmers.

Ontario, New Brunswick and Quebec shipped a total of 975,600 cords, almost a million cords, in 1939, to the United States and Germany, for a mere pittance considering the real value to our farmers and our workmen. We should not forget that a cord of wood is about equal to a

ton of newsprint and that while Canada derives only \$8.00 from a cord of pulpwood she receives \$32 from a ton of newsprint.

It will take fifty to sixty years to replace the trees that have been cut down. What will our farmers do in the meantime? What will they do in the future? These are some of the unwise acts of devastation going on in our province, while our Governments are looking on.

The farmer should be taught the principles and benefits of a sustained-yield forest management—that is, to cultivate annual crops as a natural growth on his forest land so that he could depend upon an annual revenue from this source. This would add to his family budget.

To-day our farmers all over the country, with few exceptions, are being permitted to kill the goose that lays the golden egg. They are wiping out their woodlots instead of perpetuating them.

Why do our Governments permit it? Because our Governments are afraid of offending the farmers, losing their vote and becoming unpopular. Our Governments, for the sake of the farmers' vote, would look on and see the steady supplement to their annual income dry up and disappear in order to please a political partisan party, groups of speculators or selfish interests, rather than save our national inheritance—the farmers' perpetual source of annual income—their farm woodlots.

We have given in too much to this sort of thing in the past—to-day we have to decide. To-morrow it will be too late. The condition of our forests and forest industries to-day is a lesson for to-morrow. They grew up without planning but it is not too late to plan now for the future.

It is an Empire responsibility. It is the mystic key to the contentment of our farmers, the progress and wealth of all our citizens, the salvation of our future.

We must not forget there are wooden dollars in all our pockets.

Are we going to permit partisan politics to destroy the nation's economic life—the source of our national income and revenue? I think not. Then it rests with us to

change our course. We are fighting in the open. This is the truest form of democratic government.

After fifty years of newspaper publishing in the historic city of Quebec and twenty-two years as a member of the Legislative Council, I became alarmed at our serious situation and have been devoting much of my time and means in helping to aid in saving and conserving our forests before it is too late. Our movement is gaining ground. Our following is increasing every day until we now feel that we have made satisfactory headway but there is still much to be done.

The day I made my speech in the Legislative Council in Quebec in support of my motion, the galleries were crowded with advanced students from Laval University, the Commercial Academy and the Protestant and Catholic High Schools. The next day the leading French newspapers, without a single request from me, gave my speech space of from two and a half to over seven columns. The total circulation of these newspapers was four hundred and thirty-one thousand copies. And may I pay a compliment to the Right Rev. Canon Chamberland, who is the director of a leading French Catholic newspaper of Quebec, and state to you, as a Protestant in Quebec, that his paper gave me seven columns. (Applause.) This fact is full evidence of the desire of our people to be informed.

The Government of Ontario is making a worthy first step in holding an inquiry at which all interests are invited to give testimony. The evidence being adduced will be very valuable and timely.

Our Government in Quebec is bringing in a Bill which will smooth out some of the difficulties of our mill owners. It will remove some of the heavy costs on our products. Any legislation which will reduce costs is absolutely necessary to our march of progress if we are going to retain and remain in this industry. If so, we must be prepared to conserve it in perpetuity, which I think is the desire of our people.

We must preserve our forests not only for future generations but we must conserve them on the sustained-

yield basis to keep pace with the European and American systems of management, or, we will find ourselves minus a \$155,000,000 export trade—a tragedy which would affect every province in the Dominion.

Apathy, ignorance, lack of vision, have been our weaknesses in the past. Can we throw off these shackles and lift our forests and forest industries into one of the most assured and flourishing industrial revenue producers?

The question is, will we rise to the situation, will we do our duty, will we aid in arousing public opinion to the danger which lies ahead of us? Will we influence our governments to break the stranglehold that is retarding and handicapping our opportunities in our natural markets? I think we can and will.

When one reviews the past one has to come to the conclusion that this industry has probably been the milch cow of our governments. It is the victim of partisan political influences. Happily, we are beginning to realize the errors of our ways. Our governments and our newsprint organizations are bestirring themselves. This is a splendid omen, but the public, the people, have to join and aid them.

Several statements have been recently made public, bearing upon what I have said to-day. One of them, under the caption of "Can Democracy Survive" from the editor of *Magazine Digest*, says, "Economic democracy is required to enable our political democracy to survive."

In other words, political democracy must never overcome or submerge economic democracy. Unfortunately, this is just what is happening in Quebec. It may be our economic weakness, our error and our tragic loss.

Another statement has been given to the public by one of your eminent analysts, Mr. R. W. Finlayson. He recently said:

"The sooner the Canadian newsprint manufacturers adopt such constructive practices as long-term forest projects, greater employment of cellulose research to develop a better grade of newsprint and by-products and continue the progress of getting their financial houses in

good order, the sooner they will place their units in a true competitive position. It must be remembered that newsprint is a world-wide, tariff-free commodity and here, as in other fields, the lowest cost products survive in the ever-present economic battle."

The Right Honourable Arthur Meighen said a few days ago, "Do not let us live in a paradise that we know is false."

E. A. Pierce, prominent New York stock broker, stated in a public address in Spokane, last week, that "brokers and all business men must abandon their reticence and sell themselves to the public. We must operate under ethics of which the public cannot help but approve. For the American people will not again stand for being shoved around by business, by the government and by wild-eyed revolutionists."

Mr. A. Vining, President of the Canadian Newsprint Association, one of the most active and energetic workers for government reform, in a recent brief said: "One of the curious things about the newsprint industry is the degree to which its worth remains concealed from the public eye.

"The value of newsprint exports exceeded the value of wheat exports by over ten million dollars a year.

"Newsprint touches every home and every pocket-book in Quebec and Ontario."

I might mention here that the exports of newsprint for twelve months up to last April amounted to \$216,000,000 while our wheat amounted to \$125,000,000 for the same period.

Mr. Floyd Chalmers, editor of the *Financial Post*, says: "One dollar out of every three of our national income comes from export trade. We depend upon our markets abroad for our prosperity."

To all of these opinions I emphatically say, "Hear! Hear!" They emphasize my ideal of what should be our goal to save our forests and our forest industries.

To reach our objective, public opinion must be aroused and informed through publicity and education—it will put more wooden dollars in our pockets.

It will do more—it will aid us to meet post-war conditions which will constitute one of the most serious problems which Canada has yet had to solve.

My conclusions are embodied in the following suggestions:

(1) Appointment of an international commission to conciliate differences and improve our relationship with our best newsprint consumers in the United States.

(2) Appointment of a Federal Board to further a more orderly and uniform application of Provincial and Dominion legislation to aid and develop our export trade.

(3) Appointment of Provincial Commissions of forest experts to administer local management and control.

Through these respective bodies we would remove the forests and forest industries beyond the effects of partisan political influences.

Our practical men, our technologists, our technicians and our chemists, given full responsibility to chart a course for our forests and forest industries, would speedily find other markets for those we are likely to lose in the course of the present day competition.

Our politicians could never do the job our practical men will accomplish because the latter have no axes to grind, no consideration for stock market exchanges, no demand for seeking votes and no selfish interests of any kind to which to cater.

And what of the future? It is my conviction that Japan which has had the development of her forests and forest industries in her economic vision and ambition for many years will be another formidable competitor of Canada.

Japan has had her eyes on the eastern forests of Russia, in fact she has a forty-five year tentative agreement ready to be signed and concluded at the termination of present hostilities. She will also develop the mountainous forests of China along with those of Russia. It may surprise you to know that Japan is the most alive nation in the world to-day in reforestation. She is seeding one hundred and fifty thousand acres of land per annum.

Britain will probably continue to use the forests of western Russia and Scandinavia for its own consumption and possibly for export. Russia will probably operate the mills which she has taken over from Finland and sell newsprint to London. This means that Russia to-day is not going to forsake her trade with England, particularly in her forests and forest industries, nor with the United States and Canada, in order to tie up with the German government whose word is now known to be worthless.

The question will be an important one in our post-war duties and responsibilities. It is only natural that in a short time, due to increased war demand for our newsprint and woodpulp, our newsprint mills will be running at full capacity, probably at 100 per cent instead of only 50 per cent to 60 per cent capacity.

It is also natural to realize that at the close of the war these industries may go back to pre-war conditions. This will leave us to take care of many thousands of unemployed forest workers. It is well to be reminded of this fact to-day because it will perhaps stimulate our Governments to greater activity and assistance. It should also press our scientists and chemists to increased efforts to find other uses for our forest products in order to keep as many as possible of these workers in their jobs.

Increased government financial aid will be a paying investment. This should be our main effort and our greatest objective. It is the only way to overcome the real barriers to our progress in the past. We must use our intelligence, ability and knowledge to meet the economic issue with the grit and courage of determined men and women.

We can show the world that we can and will overcome the obstacles in our path and save our forests and forest industries as one of Canadas greatest economic assets—the result of which will affect every other industry in the land.

After years of research as a journalist, member of the Government and investor, I consider that we must now listen to our practical men, the men who know our ills and complaints and can find their remedies and cures. Only

through spreading the truth, through publicity and education will we achieve our objective. (Applause.)

DR. F. A. GABY: Gentlemen, we are very much indebted to the Honourable Mr. Carrel for his excellent address on our forest resources and their conservation. He has given us a very stirring message of the necessity of organizing and influencing our governments in the conserving and maintaining of our wood supplies for the future, and stopping the loss of raw materials so necessary for the future preservation of our industry—of which newsprint is one of the largest items in our export trade—and so necessary to an economic democracy which must survive if we are to maintain our political democracy.

We are indeed honoured by having the Honourable Mr. Carrel in our presence to-day, and on your behalf I extend to him our appreciation and thanks for his excellent and inspiring address. (Applause.)

"THE PRESENT CHALLENGE TO CANADA"

AN ADDRESS PREPARED BY

THE HONOURABLE
NORMAN McLEOD ROGERS,
M.A., B.Litt., B.C.L.

MINISTER OF NATIONAL DEFENCE.

Chairman: The President, Dr. F. A. Gaby.

Monday, June 10, 1940

A Joint Meeting of the Empire Club of Canada and the Canadian Club was held in the Royal York Hotel, Toronto, on Monday, June 10, 1940.

Whilst this meeting was actually in session, the Royal Canadian Air Force bomber, especially chartered to bring Mr. Rogers to Toronto to fulfil his engagement, crashed when nine miles east of Bowmanville, Ontario, at 1.25 p.m. All persons on board were lost.

The tragedy was unknown to the meeting, and in the absence of Mr. Rogers a copy of the address which had previously been forwarded to the president of the Empire Club was read by Colonel Mess.

DR. F. A. GABY: Gentlemen: I might refer to the fact that the Honourable Norman Rogers is not here at the present moment, but we expect him, and he will have a message that will be of importance during these serious times. Probably I had better leave the remarks I was going to make until he does come, and in the meantime I would like us to have a few words from Canon Cody, who may speak to us in connection with the serious situation that is developing at the present moment.

I might make a very important announcement, that is, that Italy has declared war. Confirmation of this has been received. Italy has just declared war and I understand action is taking place already. We will now hear from Dr. Cody.

DR. H. J. CODY: Mr. Chairman, Sir William, and Gentlemen: There have been many meetings of the Canadian Club and of the Empire Club addressed by noted speakers from all parts of the world. Those speakers have dealt with problems of one kind and another in the past. Never has the Canadian Club, never has the Empire Club met under circumstances such as those of to-day. As we sit here, for the moment in peace, and awaiting a message concerning Canada's war effort, we see with our mind's eye those swaying lines in France, as French heroes are trying to stay the onward leap of the wild beast who, as Mr. Chamberlain said, sprang out of his lair and who must be disarmed and withstood. (Applause.)

This last message about Italy is but the climax of preparations long in process. I think all those who have loved the past of Italy and appreciated Italy's contribution to the civilization of the world will be grieved that the leader, Il Duce, has been toppled from his seat on the fence at a time when he thinks it is safe to fall. But he is mistaken. (Applause.) Right is right, and justice is justice, and God is God. Right will prevail and all those who have taken advantage of the present situation to grab

something for themselves will be as those who grasp at the wind—vanity of vanities.

Now, Gentlemen, just a word before Mr. Rogers comes. We Canadians are in this war by our own deliberate choice and as a result of our convictions. We are, first of all, an integral part of the British Empire. (Applause.) No matter what may be the legal quibbles, if Britain is at war we are, at any rate, open to the attack of the enemy. But we went into this war deliberately by practically unanimous vote. We do not want to be fair weather partners. We owe too much to the Motherland. We appreciate to the full what she has done in leading the onward march of civilization. Above all, we are in this struggle because we ourselves feel that the issues are so great that no freedom-loving people can dare to hold back. Later on, sooner, I am sure, rather than later, we shall find that our relatives and friends south of the line are going to put the whole weight of their munitions and their equipment, aye, and even of their man-power into the issue. That is our hope.

We have chosen deliberately. Our conscience is clear. We tried, through the Motherland, every method of avoiding this struggle. The criticism now is that we should have decided earlier, but at any rate, we did not provoke this strife. We have a clear memory of all the aggressions, all the advances the enemy has made, and now we have a firm resolution and belief that this war will be won, not simply by hosts of men, though they are needed, not merely by mass of metal munitions, tanks and guns, but in large measure by the spirit of resolution on the part of the people behind our champions. In these days no war is fought between armies. The war is being fought with all the forces of the enemy, against the armies and the civilians, against old men and weak men, and women and little children. There is no mercy. There are no bowels of compassion. So we have gone in because we know the issues.

I was speaking, the other day, to Sir Edward Beatty, and he said that the more he saw of this war and its issues,

the more he was convinced that it is a crusade, "and the Crusade was an effort to open up and make accessible the sacred places to all who wish to go thither." To-day, it is another kind of crusade, to protect the sacred places of the earth wherein dwell freedom and justice, and good faith and mercy, and humane and Christian civilization.

What makes up the civilization of the West? First of all, ordered liberty, which is a combination of both law and freedom; the scientific spirit which is the spirit of the search for truth and the enthronement of truth in the highest place; and the religious effort. That proclaims and embodies the ideas of mercy and kindness, and helpfulness and care for others.

Every one of those elements in our western civilization is being assaulted and derided and trodden under foot. It is a crusade and Canada dare not stand idle, and Canada is not standing idle, and I am sure that this great gathering to-day is but an outward symbol of the inward purpose of all Canadian people—that it is not how little we can do and get away with, but how much we can do, up to the very limit of Canada's man-power, (Applause) Canada's brains and Canada's wealth. All must be thrown into the scales or there will be no Canada worth living in.

Lord Halifax said the other day, "I would rather be dead than living in a world dominated by Hitlerism." But we shall not die, except in paying the price for an ultimate victory of justice and freedom.

I have just come down from the University and as I passed the Memorial Tower this morning, I saw there the names of six hundred and more of our graduates who gave all a man can give, life itself, for God, for King, for Country; for loved ones, home and Empire; for the sacred cause of justice and the freedom of the world.

Those are the words, you will recognize, on the Unknown Warrior's tomb in Westminster Abbey. But what struck me above everything else were these two quotations. The first is a quotation from the funeral address that the ancient Greek, Pericles, gave for the sons of Greece who had died for freedom: "Take these men for your en-

samples, and remember that prosperity is only for the free, and that freedom is the sure possession only of those who have the courage to defend it." Freedom of Canada, freedom of the Empire, freedom of France, freedom of the United States and of all those who love liberty the world over—it is the sure possession of those only who have the courage to defend it. Have we that courage? I believe we have. Give us the chance and we will show it.

The other inscription is that well known poem, written by a graduate in Arts and Medicine of the University of Toronto—John McCrae. And how that last verse still poignantly challenges us! The dead in Flanders are speaking:

Take up our quarrel with the foe:
To you from falling hands we throw
The torch; be your's to hold it high.
If ye break faith with us who die
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
In Flanders' fields.

The same challenge, Gentlemen, comes to us in Canada again to-day and as we answer it by personal service, by contribution, by high enthusiasm and resolution, so shall we pass on the torch to those who shall come after us.

Can I give you in closing a better message than that which Rudyard Kipling gave us in the last Great War?

No easy hope or lies
Shall bring us to our goal,
But iron sacrifice
Of body, will, and soul.
There is but one task for all—
One life for each to give.
What stands if Freedom fall?
Who dies if England live?

That is again the challenge. It is no easy task, and Italy's advent makes the task still harder. But surely,

there afresh, is evoked the contribution that Canada's sons and daughters can give for freedom, for justice, for mercy, for a human civilization, for the right of the little nations to live, for the sacredness of the pledged word. These are sacred. They are, verily, the reflection of the character of God himself, so that with all reverence, as our King said, we commit our cause to Almighty God and devote ourselves with hand and heart and will to winning a victory for that which is right and true. (Applause.)

DR. F. A. GABY: We thank most heartily Dr. Cody for the stirring message that he has given us at this moment, in this trying hour.

I have no further message to give you at the present moment, but I am expecting one every minute as to the location of the Honourable Mr. Rogers. We understand that the Honourable Mr. Rogers will land within about two minutes. Now, the word we have got doesn't say whether he will land at the Island Airport or at the Malton Airport. I expect it will be the Island Airport. In the meantime, we have here a copy of his address. Now, if it is your wish we will ask Colonel Mess to read this to you.

The following manuscript, as prepared by the Honourable Norman McLeod Rogers, Minister of National Defence, was read by Colonel James Mess:

"When I was in London a little more than a month ago I received invitations from the officers of the Canadian Club and the Empire Club to speak at meetings in Toronto. It was suggested by cable that I might address a joint meeting rather than two meetings in view of the difficulty of making engagements during the time Parliament was in Session. That was about the end of April, and our common intention was that I should speak of my visit to England and France, and give you my impression of the soldiers and airmen of Canada who were completing their training in England.

Events have moved so rapidly since then that much of

what would have been appropriate a month ago has already lost its interest. It has not lost its significance, nor its value for history, but rarely in the course of world affairs has there been such an extraordinary upheaval as has occurred since the 10th of May—just a month ago to-day. Perhaps it will be more fitting, therefore, if the general character of my remarks is not quite as was originally intended, and if I place more emphasis on the present challenge to Canada, rather than on the preparation for a climax which has come with a sudden intensity that was not foreseen by many, even as late as April of this year.

There are some events, however, which I cannot pass over. I want to tell you about the Toronto Scottish Regiment and the 48th Highlanders of Canada. Shortly after my arrival in England I was invited to dinner with the officers of the detachment of the Toronto Scottish which was supplying the guard for Buckingham Palace at the time. They had just relieved the Royal 22nd Regiment who had the previous tour of duty. I enjoyed an evening with our own Canadians from Toronto, men who had been selected to carry out the most important of all the duties, short of active service, for which trained men may be called upon. And the next day when I passed by the Palace gate and saw the men standing rigidly at attention, or walking smartly to and fro on their beat, I was conscious of a very deep sense of pride as I realized that these men of Canada were standing guard over the King and the Royal Family at the heart of the Empire.

Later on in my visit I had the privilege of seeing the 48th Highlanders. They were being reviewed at Aldershot by the Earl of Athlone and the Princess Alice, whom we hope to welcome to Ottawa in the near future. There was a formal inspection and march past, which reflected the highest credit on the officers and men of this famous Regiment. There is no doubt that the 48th Highlanders will maintain in this war its already great and historic traditions.

Another unit in which you will all be interested is No. 110 (City of Toronto) Army Co-Operation Squadron,

R.C.A.F., in which there are men from every province in Canada. It is peculiarly fitting that this squadron should be the first of a Canadian Air Force to be overseas in this or any war. The last words these men said as I left them after seeing their quarters and training ground was that they wanted above all else to serve with Canadian troops in the field. I assured them, as I do you, that everything possible will be done to carry out that wish. Since then, as you know, No. 112 Squadron has also proceeded overseas.

There is another unit of which I have a vivid memory. While it is not a part of the Canadian Army, all of its officers and most of the men in its ranks are Canadians. I am speaking of No. 242 Squadron of the Royal Air Force which I visited just before embarking on my return voyage. The officers and men in that squadron are young Canadians who left this country prior to the war to join the British Air Force. On the outbreak of war, the Government of the United Kingdom decided to bring together into one squadron many of the Canadians who were at that time posted to different squadrons. This became No. 242 Fighter Squadron. They are equipped with fighter and pursuit planes and when I saw them they were completely ready for action. They gave a display which showed the almost incredible speed with which they were able to get their machines off the ground and into action after the alarm was given. I am not able to say whether these men have seen active service since then, but I do know that they were expecting to receive orders at any time to move to the front.

But I must not dwell too long on memories, inspiring though they may be. I think you will understand me when I say that in view of what has happened in the last month it was a matter of consideration whether I should be able to come here to-day or not. Being here, however, I should like to put before you as simply as possible, the position in which we find ourselves and the efforts that are being made to mobilize the resources of this country in the earnest and vigorous prosecution of the war.

Last September, together with Great Britain and France, we observed the progress of the Polish campaign. It was carried out and completed almost exactly in accordance with German plans. How far those plans were disarranged by Russia's action in Eastern Poland is a matter of no consequence at present. Various explanations were given of Poland's inability to offer more extended resistance. We were told that Poland relied too much on cavalry; that the expected rains did not occur; that the Poles were not a united people.

The average person was of the opinion, however, that things would be different when it came to an attack on the Maginot Line. And in expressing that faith the average person consciously or otherwise, ranged himself on the side of some very eminent and highly trained military officers. We had read or had been told of the mighty Maginot Line. The Germans obviously thought it was formidable and they built the West Wall. The Dutch planned a system of flooding and the Belgians built extensive boundary fortifications and secondary water defences. A further defence line was prepared on the Franco-Belgian border. The general feeling was that, slow to start as the democracies might be, the French, British and Belgians could probably hold their lines and hold them long enough to complete the necessary preparations behind their protection. No doubt there were some far-seeing men who believed and stated their belief that the Germans would break through. The number of such persons is perhaps not as great as the number of those who now say that they were not of that mind last Autumn. It was considered, not by ourselves alone, that we should plan, not on throwing our maximum effective strength into battle at the outset, but that we should gear our machinery to reach its highest pitch at a time when it would do the greatest good, having in mind the general military situation.

Since then, however, we have seen the German army advance across Holland and Belgium and deep into France. Italy is threatening on the other side. The critical period has been advanced, and with it has come the necessity of

advancing our own speed. The First Division and ancillary troops have been at the disposal of the United Kingdom for some time. Major-General McNaughton, as you know, with members of his staff, were at Calais and Dunkerque giving valuable aid to the Chief of the Imperial General Staff. Destroyers of the Royal Canadian Navy are operating in the battle area with the British Navy. The training and departure of the Second Division are being hastened. A Third Division is being mobilized and the infantry units of a Fourth Division have been named and are being organized. The ancillary units of a Canadian Corps are being mobilized. The Veterans Home Guards are being recruited and plans are under way for the establishment of reserve Veterans Companies to be attached to the Non-Permanent Active Militia units. Equipment orders are being rushed to completion. Valuable stocks of war material have been sent to the United Kingdom and have arrived there. Canadian soldiers have been sent to the West Indies under the escort of units of the Royal Canadian Navy. The importance of that duty cannot be over-emphasized when you recall the amount of oil that is being shipped through the Caribbean Sea every twenty-four hours. Manufacturers of war equipment and supplies are putting on extra shifts to rush to completion the orders that are pending. New orders are being given at a more rapid rate than ever before. Citizens and associations of citizens are coming forward with suggestions, many of which are of the greatest assistance. Organized labour has responded wholeheartedly to the call.

This is not our final answer. No answer can be said to be final until we have exhausted every possibility of increasing the aid which we may give. No nation, and perhaps least of all our own, is capable of saying what its ultimate effort will be until that point of exhaustion has been reached. But as a nation, we are pledged to give our utmost and that we will certainly do.

There is one development of some importance on which I would like to say a few words. There was a variety of causes for the successful conquest of Norway, which in-

cludes the audacity and skill of the German staff, the almost appalling disregard of their commanders for loss of life among their own troops, a long and carefully planned programme of treachery and the use of parachute troops. The same features have marked the succeeding campaign in the Low Countries and Northern France, with the addition of a specialized form of assault by divisions of heavily armoured tanks and motor vehicles. It would not be possible to deal at any length with all these factors. I have no fear that French and British staff work will not be a match for the German. It is more than a truism that there is a defence for any form of attack. There is no doubt that the British withdrawal across the channel was accompanied by less loss of life than the crossing of the German troopships over the Skagerrak to Norway, in spite of the vastly different odds. England and France will develop, if they have not already done so, an adequate defence against parachute troops and night landings by aeroplanes.

But the final factor is the one which comes most nearly home to us to-day. I refer, of course, to the so-called fifth column activities. There can be no tolerance whatever for the alien who has come to Canada and who remains actively sympathetic toward Germany and the German Government. Internment of such people is a very mild form of punishment, for they are traitors to the land of their adoption. They must not be allowed at large. The Royal Canadian Mounted Police were sufficiently ready that on the outbreak of war all those who professed such active sympathy were at once interned. The same stricture applies to the alien who is admitted to Canadian citizenship and takes out naturalization papers with mental reservations as to the support he will offer this country in a time of emergency. His good faith must be unquestioned and unquestionable if he is to continue to enjoy the privileges that are afforded to him here. Action has already been taken against certain Canadians, fortunately few in numbers, who, would set themselves up as Leaders

of Fascist or Communist groups and would cast aside forever all the essentials of democratic freedom.

We are all aware that German methods reach farther than that. We know that there may be German sympathizers among the naturalized Canadians. We know that Germany will not hesitate to make use of those whose weakness or greed will allow themselves to be suborned to treachery. And we know that confusion in our own ranks is exactly what the enemy likes to see. I intend to be just as specific as I can be, because I am impressed by the particularity of the proposals that have been made by individuals and associations in this country. It has been suggested that the present emergency requires the internment of all naturalized Canadians of enemy alien origin. We shall never, I believe, subscribe to that policy of total proscription. There are thousands of naturalized Canadian citizens who are here among us because they have seen and experienced the horrors that accompany oppressive government in other lands. They expected freedom of thought and action when they came here and so far as it lies within us they should receive what they expected to secure. But they must not cross the line that divides loyalty from treason in this country. If they do, they forfeit the rights they have acquired, and will be dealt with accordingly.

There is another menace against which we must also stand on guard. I refer to the well-meaning citizen who spreads rumours without facts, whose imagination pictures trouble where there is no trouble, and who frightens his neighbour with fabulous stories of the Nazi meeting-house just around the corner in a cellar. That Canadian citizen, loyal to his very finger tips, will be indignant when I say that he is Hitler's best friend; but that is nothing more nor less than the truth. Let me make my meaning perfectly clear. If there is a weekly meeting of Nazi sympathizers, we want to know. They will be dealt with if we give the proper authorities the facts, and they will be dealt with as they deserve. It is true that it is not always easy to get facts, but if you have reasonable

grounds for suspicion, please tell us, quickly. In many cases, you will find that the persons you suspect are already being watched by competent authorities.

There is need for increasing vigilance and caution. There is no need for undue alarm. The immediate demand is to hasten the help that we can bring to our allies. The fewer detours there are the better. The people of France are suffering actual, not apprehended, destruction of their lives and property. France stands with her back to the wall. England faces the possibility of invasion, which if it comes will mean vicious destruction of property. We must never forget our own needs. Measures are being taken and will continue to be carried out to afford protection to our own country. But our contribution of men and equipment and material must go on, and must be available for use when it is most needed.

You will feel, perhaps, that I have not brought you good news to-day. The seriousness of the situation does not warrant the expression of optimistic platitudes. It is better to face grim realities with courage and resolution. But let us never lose for a moment our supreme confidence in final victory. Our clearest light at this time is the undying conviction that the forces of tyranny and oppression cannot prevail. History can show us blacker periods of depression. There have been times when the oppressor's might has held almost the whole world in subjection and when the outlook of those who loved freedom must have been filled with despair. But, that which is wrong can ever become right by virtue of conquest and force of arms is wholly unbelievable. Whether it is this month or this year, next year or later, so long as we hold fast to the faith that is in us and labour unceasingly for the ideals that are dear to us, sooner or later the world of reason and humanity will be restored. In this faith we will fight on, will endure and we will win. (Applause.)

DR. F. A. GABY: We exceedingly regret that we have no word at the present moment of the Honourable Mr. Rogers. I may say, the first information we had that the

Trans-Canada was grounded was some ten minutes after eleven this morning, and it was too late to get any word to our membership of the delay. I immediately got in touch with Mr. Rogers and he said he would at that moment take a plane, which he did, and he expected to get here about a quarter past one. They must have met with unfortunate circumstances that have delayed him in getting here at this time.

We must thank Colonel Mess for the way in which he has delivered the address of the Honourable Mr. Rogers.

I don't know that we can wait any longer, or whether you would desire to wait any longer for the arrival of the Honourable Mr. Rogers. I am sure he is doing everything he possibly can to be here. The latest word was that he was within two minutes of the airport, whether Malton or the Island I cannot say.

This is a joint meeting of the Empire and the Canadian Clubs. Maybe Mr. Courtice, the President of the Canadian Club, would like to say a few words.

MR. A. R. COURTICE: Gentlemen, I think there is nothing further I can say, other than that the meeting is adjourned.

"THE BLITZKRIEG IN FLANDERS"

AN ADDRESS BY

GREGORY CLARK.

Thursday, August 15, 1940

A Joint Meeting of the Empire Club of Canada and the Canadian Club was held in the Royal York Hotel, Toronto, on Thursday, August 15, 1940. Mr. A. R. Courtice, President of the Canadian Club, presided.

MR. A. R. COURTICE: Gentlemen: Gregory Clark has become a household name in his native city of Toronto. He has been associated with the *Toronto Daily Star* since 1912, except for the years 1916-18 when he was on active service overseas. He distinguished himself there, at Vimy Ridge, with the Fourth Canadian Mounted Rifles and was awarded the Military Cross for conspicuous bravery.

Gregory Clark has demonstrated over and over again his great love for humanity and he believes, in those words of Abraham Lincoln, that "God must have loved the common men because he made so many of them."

It is also a tribute to him that he loves dogs and fishing. In fact he is such a fish fancier that the number of his motor license used to bear the insignia of H₂O, which also reflects his keen sense of humour.

In his work for the *Star*, Mr. Clark has travelled extensively. As you know he has recently returned from a great trip overseas and through the many privileges extended to him by the military authorities he is in the position to-day to tell us of his actual experiences on the battle-grounds in France, culminating in that thrilling story of the evacuation from Dunkerque to Dover. In his brilliant writings and broadcasts of these experiences Mr.

Clark has done a great job, not only for his newspaper, but for his city and his country.

Gentlemen, it is my pleasure to present to you Mr. Gregory Clark. (Applause.)

MR. GREGORY CLARK: Mr. Chairman, Fellow Guests and Gentlemen: This is no time of year to engage in heated controversy, so I shall confine my remarks to anecdote and impression in the hope that these incidents will in some measure fill in and lend a little colour of life and humanity to your impressions of the war.

I sometimes think these days that it is far harder to be British outside the Isles than in them. We British who are thousands of miles from the actuality of war—we Canadians, Australians and the rest of us—are labouring under a very heavy disadvantage.

You know, compulsion is a great thing. You say to yourself, "I must get my teeth attended to. I bet my teeth are responsible for much of the way I have been feeling of late", but you put it off. Then one fine day you get a terrible, ripping toothache or you bite an apple and one of your front teeth falls out, so you go at last to the dentist.

Compulsion—and once started, you stick. The whole job is done. It takes weeks. It ruins your whole programme. It costs you hundreds of dollars, but there is nothing much short of the birth of a son that makes a man so consciously proud and satisfied with himself as finishing with the dentist.

As far as the war is concerned, we in Canada are in the position of the man who feels he ought to have his teeth attended to. There is no compulsion. The fact that we have compulsory laws and war measures is no more to the point than that we have the laws of nature and medical science. Over in England they have the toothache. The compulsion is there. It matters not what laws have been passed nor by what compulsory mandate the government may take the life of a man or woman in hand. They have that larger compulsion—the war at their door.

I do not know by what means Canada will be brought abreast of Britain in this struggle. Exhortation alone will not do. There is not one of us, however self-centred and self-concerned, who does not realize what we are likely to lose if we lose the war. I imagine there are some of us who think privately, very privately, that whatever happens life will go along much the same, but those who think so are the super-Britons—those so imbedded in the sense of security which six centuries of British dominance of its own life and affairs have inspired, that they are like the porcupine. A porcupine simply curls up and distends its quills. But there are two animals who know a trick. They are the lynx and the wolverine. These two eat porcupines quite regularly. They just insert their taloned paws under the snow beneath the porcupine and rip up where there are no quills.

But this is sheer exhortation. It will not be by process of reason or by emotional appeal that Canada will be roused to the full reality of this war. I dare not predict by what other means we shall be roused. All I can vouch for is this fact—that so long as we are free men we are in danger. So long as we think as we like, speak as we like, so long as each of us cherishes that little dominion of ourselves in which we are monarch, we are in deadly danger. For the kind of world power which is now our enemy is not the enemy of our possessions, our markets, our wealth or our prestige. Those are the tawdry things that nations used to make war for. Our enemy to-day is the enemy of our ideals, of our minds, of our everyday thoughts, of our freedom. We can lose our wealth and still be men. What our enemy to-day wishes to take from us is intangible, it is that which six centuries of British men have lived and died to bequeath to us. If we lose it, we are far less than men. We are wasters.

I say I do not know by what means Canada shall be roused, for, of course, roused she must be. Sending men away to foreign lands is not enough. Giving up our sons and brothers is not enough. Britain sent an army of a third of a million men into the foreign soil of France, but,

because that was not enough, because those men were not armed and equipped to withstand the arms and equipment of the enemy, that third of a million men had to be rescued, not ignominiously, but miraculously, from France and now stand at bay on their own soil where they have at least the satisfaction of knowing that their nation is now roused to the pitch of supplying them with fighting material that will enable them to stand.

It is improbable that Canada will one day soon be having her cities and factories bombed, but if we are to preserve what is British we must preserve Britain. If the preservation of Britain required that we should have to have our Canadian cities bombed in order to act as we should in this crisis, how many of us here would wish that our fair cities be bombed? Or would we prefer to wait our turn and take the bombing when it comes?

I witnessed the bombing of one country that thought it was prepared, that assumed it was prepared. Only last spring I stood right here before some of you, fresh from France, and I told you about the Maginot Line. I told you no human power could penetrate it. I was right but there was a human power that went around it.

After telling you of the might of the French Army and of the readiness of the British Army and of the Maginot Line, I went back again to France and arrived two days after Holland and Belgium had been invaded. I was exactly in time to see that Might brushed away as though it were dust. Of the secret of that power that so brushed aside the calculated power of two great nations, nobody can speak with any great authority until the conclave of dispassionate historians have sorted the facts.

We do know the British had one armoured division, the French had four and the Germans had eleven. We do know that the Germans employed the armoured divisions in a method that was radical and new and wholly unexpected, and it is also probable that we have exaggerated in our minds the amount of treachery that helped bring about the success of that overwhelming strength of armoured divisions, because eleven divisions of tanks require little

treachery to smash through five. No, it seems to me this interminable talk of treachery and fifth column is a very handy excuse for our failure in producing the materials of war.

We can still take our choice. We can still talk of treachery and fifth columns and politics, this and that—or we can produce—and believe me, production is not a matter for government alone. Production in war comes out of the very spirit and essence of a people. War production is, you might say, the spirit and essence of the people made manifest.

I arrived in France in the nick of time to accompany the great retreat from Brussels to Boulogne. I had been over in the winter to see the whole set-up. I had spent two weeks in civilian clothes at British General Headquarters and had got to know the thirty odd war correspondents who wore the uniform—ace newspapermen from Britain, America, Australia, Africa and a few from France itself. I met such great names as Sir Philip Gibbs, Ward Price, Sir André Maurois. They had been out at General Headquarters, living in dowdy little hotels in Arras ever since October, most of them. Long weary months they were. Months of no news. Do you remember them—those intolerable newsless months, full of small patrol encounters in the snow near Metz, isolated one-plane raids over Scottish ports?

Well, news came. With incomparable suddenness and fury, news came and I came with it in uniform. I arrived at half-past three in the afternoon at Calais, caught the half-past five for Arras, sat in a fine pullman coach and watched out the window to see the trainloads of refugees streaming past at every siding from Holland and Belgium. It was a lovely May afternoon. Paris had been all excited over the breaking of this boil of war.

It was nine o'clock in the evening when we drew into Arras station. It was almost deserted. Three days later it was so crowded, hour by hour, day and night, that you could not enter it. A week later it was in ashes, but there in the gloaming I got out and had a French porter carry

my war bag across the station square to my hotel, the Commerce, where in the winter I had been a resident along with all the other correspondents.

The Commerce was deserted of correspondents and even of soldiers. Its sole guests were a rather well-to-do motoring lot of Belgians, the first of the refugees. Mademoiselle Odette, the manageress of the hotel, told me all my colleagues were up at Lille, nearer the blitzkrieg on Belgium.

In the hotel annex were the offices of P.R. 3, which is the military title of the department of General Headquarters which has to do with war correspondents. There I found one officer who advised me I could go by car the following day. He said the Commerce was full but I could go down the street half a block to the Hotel de L'Univers, where several of the Headquarters Officers were staying.

I put my equipment in the hotel and hunted for a working party to carry my huge war bag. I couldn't find a working party. All of the younger troops attached to these particular offices were down at the cinema to see a movie. The war was two or three days away up in Belgium and Holland. That gives an idea of the remoteness of war, as felt in Arras that night.

Finally, the only remaining officer of my group said, "I think we will try to fit you up at this hotel. You can't carry this stuff down." We consulted Mademoiselle Odette and she said that she had one room, that of an officer who hadn't come back. I got the stuff upstairs and I went back to the night offices of P.R. 3 in Arras. It was a pleasant May night. An aeroplane crossed low—about five hundred feet. I said, with some twenty-year-old anxiety, "That is a Hun." "O, no, that is not a Hun. If it were a Hun they would be firing at it." I said, "Well, it is funny how memory gets distorted in twenty years. I would have sworn that was a Hun." The plane crossed over again, he swung out and crossed again, and I said, "That is a Hun." He swung out and crossed a third time and completed that run. He dropped six bombs and missed

the General Headquarters of the British Army by one house, so accurately did he bomb.

That was the first bombing our people experienced. From then on we had no rest and inside of ten minutes Arras was in flames. In half an hour by the bright light the bombers came and were bombing the edges of the town, various army parks. That was the beginning of the blitzkrieg, as I know it.

I had the curious fortune of arriving within half an hour of the beginning. The following morning, very early, arrangements were made to join my colleagues in the line. A bomb had hit the side of the hotel that I was about to go down to if I had been able to find a working party to carry my kit. I was very happy that a working party had not been found and when I went to Lille I was able to tell the correspondents that all the kits in the hotel were damaged.

These men, you understand, had been in France from October, waiting through a weary winter and spring for the news to break. They looked with some disfavour on a man who came from a far country to get there half an hour before it started.

We were put in our cars, two to a car, with a conducting officer who was a regular army officer, and scattered in various directions over the area of Brussels, where the main attack was taking place. Some were within a mile or so of Louvain, where the guards were making a magnificent but hopeless stand against the German mechanized units.

Of my experiences I don't wish to talk to-day, because I have spoken and written fully of them. The merciless bombing of civilian hordes—it is estimated there were four million Dutch, Belgian and Northern Frenchmen, old men chiefly, women and children—in that retreat. And how skilfully the bombing was done to force the great throngs on the highways and the secondary roads that the British and French army would have to use. That, I don't wish to speak of. Its inhumanity can never be described adequately. Some day, perhaps, commissions will take down

and make truthful sworn records of all the monstrous, random attacks on these cities.

In general it is possible for me to say the Germans never waste a bomb. To think that they go about dropping bombs at random is the greatest mistake you could possibly conceive. They waste not a bomb, they attempt in every attack to make the bomb do damage. They do not always succeed, as we know. What they are getting now in the way of opposition and resistance is far different from the early days in France when in confusion indescribable, they did pretty much as they wished.

We went out two days, in various directions. We struggled against this tide of refugees. We had to go around cities, around towns. We had to take country roads, little twisted and hopeless-looking country roads, in order to pass at all. The main highways were as densely packed as the floor of this room, all moving at the dreadful, slow pace set by the weakest, the smallest, the oldest and the feeblest. A dreadful sight!

At the end of the second day we had to return to Lille, our headquarters, to hear a statement by the colonel commanding the unit. Every day at five o'clock he gave a statement of the situation. On the second day of our return to Lille, about the fourth or fifth day of the attack on Flanders, we arrived at the hotel and found Major McCormack, the second-in-command of the press organization, standing on the hotel steps, very white of face, saying, "There will be no conference. Pay your hotel bills, get your bags and get in the cars. Your conducting officers are instructed to take you to Arras."

That was our first intimation that something was dreadfully wrong, that this confusion which had been obvious in the highways and the roads had somehow got into the very texture of this army and these forces of which we were an observing part.

We got back to Arras at about half-past eight or nine o'clock at night and I had my driver leave the highway, go up north via Lens so I could have a look at the Vimy Memorial, the unveiling of which I had witnessed. I

didn't bid it "Good-bye", but I gave it a long look, for at its foot are eight thousand of my comrades. I heard later that it had been destroyed. In the evacuation I talked with many men who had seen it damaged. I may say it was I who made a request to James Spence at Canada House, asking for an air photograph. I said, "It is the simplest thing in the world for a bomber returning to dive down to a sufficiently low height and by a telephoto lens prove or disprove this monstrous accusation which, if true, will do what it must do to Canadian people, but if it proves later not to be true, will only disconcert the Canadian people and cause distrust. I would like to know if it is destroyed or if it is not destroyed."

However, there it stood in beauty and pathos, with the two pylons facing the east from which once again came those great hordes, and near the foot of which are eight thousand of my comrades, though it commemorates sixty thousand of them.

In Arras that night, we sat up a long time. Some of us went to bed, perhaps a little exhausted and with a little premonition of what was to follow. Very early in the morning we were all aroused and told to get into our cars because we were going back to Amiens. We waited, and through the constant change and counterchange of plans it was noon before we finally left Arras for Amiens. As we left Arras, by roads that a day before we had travelled in motor cars with the greatest freedom, we found barricades already up. We tried to go via Doullens but the guards said that route was not available for us. German parachutists were reported to have landed between us and Amiens. That gives an idea of how quickly, how disconcertingly the news came to us in the midst of that retreat, overlaid on every side by this immense tide, this frantic and ever more frenzied tide of refugees, each day more hungry, each day more exhausted and sleepless, each day less manageable.

In the midst of that overwhelming confusion, were the troops, the mechanized equipment and vehicles, all trying

to work and get into the position that they had been ordered to take.

We had left Arras at noon and we didn't get into Amiens until dusk. Amiens is a beautiful city—most of you remember it. It was now so crowded that there was not a place to sit down to eat. One or two of us, being old soldiers, remembered an old restaurant called the Coq d'Or. We found that it was functioning and we rushed to the hotel where we were told to deposit our bags and got together a party. But by the time we got back to the Coq d'Or, we met the proprietress coming out with some of the teapots and silver in her hands. Within a matter of an hour or an hour and a half, so quick did the destruction come, they too had joined the ever-increasing tide of refugees.

Amiens was under bombing all the time. They bombed the station, the aerodromes and the mechanized parks and military areas. Then also, there was the bombing of the civilians, wherever they took rest when they could go no further. You never saw parks so crowded. They were packed so you could see no turf. Then of course the Germans would bomb them. They would bomb them so they would move beyond the town where the roads were not sufficiently congested and where our army traffic actually was able to move. But most of the bombing on Amiens and Arras was on points of military importance, particularly the station at Amiens. It was filled with old men and women, and when the bombs did strike, the deaths could be counted in hundreds.

How easy it was now for the fifth column. I am perfectly convinced that in the hordes of refugees there were any number of German soldiers, German Intelligence men and advance men, trained for months to join these hordes and function in the interests of disorder.

The only actual death in our group of thirty was one of the drivers who was killed from a pistol shot from the crowd—a pistol shot that was completely untraceable but came from a fifth columnist. Of our party, one, Major Roger Machell, was almost fatally wounded in a bombing

attack at Boulogne. One of our censors was wounded or captured. We carried our field censors with us and they censored the press copy as we wrote it, and it was put on such means of communication as were available. One of our conducting officers was later killed and two were wounded; but by a curious and possibly unjust circumstance, no newspaperman was either killed or wounded.

We got to bed in Amiens and by this time we knew that we were being of no service, either to our public, to our papers or to the Army. When we got to bed about eleven o'clock we were extremely exhausted and we had not been fed because I assure you it is difficult to eat when past you goes this endless throng of women and children, so obviously starving and hungry. You couldn't swallow a mouthful if you had to. It is a psychic confusion you get into in such times that only those who have suffered flood and disaster can understand. I was awakened about four o'clock in the morning by the captain who said to us, "Get up at once. They are on both sides of the town." We asked "What about our kits?", and he said, "Leave them in the court-yard of the hotel." I came down to the court-yard with my haversack and such stuff as I could carry. Newspaper correspondents are famous for the size of their kits.

William Stoneman, of the *Chicago News*, whom I regard as a great newspaperman and a charming person, looked at his kit, and said, "I have a hunch I may not see you again", so he wrote a note, "*Bitte in Sicherheit zu halten.*" "Please hold safely" and signed it "Wilhelm Steinman, *Chicago Daily News.*" The joke was on William. In less than twenty-four hours his kit was in the hands of the Germans and doubtless they opened it and kept it safely.

We were taken to an adjoining hotel where the conducting officers were staying. Our cars were there, engines running, but we spent two hours waiting for orders. By this time they were bombing the station at the foot of the street. Finally orders came to move and as our convoy of cars worked its way past the foot of the

street where our hotel had been we saw the street in flames. I don't know whether the Germans are wearing my shoes or whether the fire got them.

As you know, there were three evacuations. There was the evacuation of Boulogne; and when it fell, Calais was held for a day or so; and then Dunkerque, from which the main body of the army was evacuated.

We arrived at Boulogne about four o'clock on Saturday afternoon. Our cars were taken from us to be used for more important work. There we sat Sunday and Monday and Tuesday, until noon, under bomb fire, in the midst of this tremendous tide of refugees, and we had a chance to try to conceive what was happening, and why, to these two mighty armies that we had lived among, some of us, for eight and a half months. I could tell you our views—they wouldn't be of much interest now. They are one with Ninevah and Tyre. So is Boulogne. What the Germans had left when we got out, our Navy and Air Force went back and finished.

The Hotel Maurice, where we stayed, was a three-storey hotel, around a little court-yard with a glass roof. It was filled with refugees. We took the top floor. It was built of wall paper and laths. Edward Angley and I shared a room. I am addicted to one-half of my pyjamas, which half you will understand when I say I am addicted also to nightshirts. A bomber came very near and dropped a bomb at the farther end of the street. Angley leaped out of bed and said, "Let us get out of here." I said, "Get back to bed. Lightning never strikes twice in the same place." "Very well", he said, "I'll take your word for it, you know more about it than I do." I said, "We must get some sleep. To-morrow or the next day we may be in the water. We don't know where we will be. We must get rest." In addition to my other defects, I snore. Angley lay raised on his elbow, cheek in hand, hating me, when a second bomber dropped a load on the far corner of the block our hotel was in. The women and children streamed out of the rooms of the hotel and we heard the thud of their feet and their screams

and sobs along the halls down to the basement. This time we were lifted bodily a foot or two off our beds by the concussion that seemed to bulge out the walls of the edifice. We leaped out and I said, "Let's get out of here." Anglely said, "Okay, you know more about it than I do, I'll take your word for it!"

We went downstairs and stood in an archway where there were a few people who couldn't stand the congestion and heat and stuffiness of the basement caves and dug-outs. I had my dressing-gown and slippers. Mine was a kind of towelling bath-robe that I had bought in France when I lost my kit. We were trying to cheer the people up as we stood there. Across from us was a Belgian baby that had the tremors that affect small infants during bombings. The mother was past weeping and was making the strange sounds that a child makes when it has given up crying. Presently a French military nurse, in her blue uniform—a large, imposing-looking woman—hearing the good humour of Anglely and myself and sizing up my beautiful gown, came over and said very politely, "May I borrow your dressing-gown to wrap this little baby in?" Amid Anglely's laughter that could be heard half-way to London, he said, "You cannot have this gentleman's dressing-gown, but you can have mine."

Dunkerque was by no means the only port of evacuation. From both Boulogne and Calais there were evacuations on a very considerable scale. While the main body of the Army had retreated on Dunkerque, many units especially mechanized and armoured had come southward in the hope of joining the French. Thousands of Air Force personnel, ground crews and mechanics had been forced back on Boulogne in the abandonment of their aerodromes.

When it was finally decided to be rid of the thirty war correspondents, we left Boulogne at high noon, on a mine layer—a little ship smaller than a Niagara boat with over two thousand Air Force men on it.

Due to the strategy and the tactics of the enemy—using the unexpected and the new to the fullest degree, smash-

ing holes with tanks and then driving fast units of tanks through the crowded and confused back areas, attacking all artillery resistance, with Stuka dive bombers while tanks raided the infantry positions and movements that the artillery was trying to cover, disdaining many of the oldest laws of war in favour of methods both daring and hazardous—there was never an hour in all that retreat when anybody could say where any section of the situation had clarified or solidified. We who were in the retreat were ravenous for news of the retreat when we got back to England.

Physical confusion is a weapon by which the Germans set great store. I do not suggest that confusion was as general as we experienced, but it is sheer nonsense to suggest the confusion inspired and developed and exploited by the Germans in every possible direction was not the major factor in the success of the blitzkrieg in France.

Most of you here are business men. You have all suffered blitzkriegs in business. You have your business world well organized and well fortified in all directions. Then, without warning, someone strikes with a new method, a new system, a new product, a new way of producing or marketing. You know how ruthless those opponents are and how great is their advantage in surprise.

There is often dire confusion and sometimes ruin in sections of the business world where something new is launched with brains and cold determination. But there is this to be said for such a simile. They always have to have the goods. If they haven't the goods, the cleverest strategy in the world does no more than upset business for a time.

It is hard to believe that the Germans have the goods, not merely for the world at large but for the progress of mankind. Their ideas are not new, but old—old and discarded ages ago. They are trying to get the world to go back beyond the horse and buggy, back beyond the ox cart, right back to the time when mankind plodded on its weary feet, a world of slaves and pilgrims, while the overlords sang wassail in the castles on the hills.

Oh, it is noble to walk, noble and holy to divest yourself of all the soft, flabby vices and stand forth muscular and strong. But old age is flabby, and childhood is soft, and these we have seen butchered and driven mad. As for muscles and strength, no man was ever as strong as a gorilla; and the ideals of the gorilla seem to have got by some scandal of miscegenation into the German nation.

One of the strangest things I heard during the retreat was from a French infantry officer that I shared the road with for a few miles. On his sector a German bomber had been shot down and of the crew, two, an officer and a non-commissioned officer, were uninjured and brought before him as prisoners of war. He was sitting at a table in the cottage that was his headquarters. The two Germans were marched in by a guard. The officer asked them their names and rank. That is all a soldier is supposed to give when captured. It is usually the prelude to some crafty conversation by which the victor hopes to acquire information. No sooner had the prisoners answered the questions than they launched immediately into a tirade. To the complete astonishment of the officer, the two took turn about and, with fury and eloquence, heaped scorn and contempt on the French. They were a putrescent race whom the Germans had come to cleanse and destroy—pure Hitler, streaming out of these two youngsters in jeopardy.

The outraged French officer fingered the pistol at his belt and ordered them to be silent. They raved on. He shouted at them to be silent. They stood stiff and recited their piece breathlessly, in a sort of frenzy. "What did you do?" I asked. "I ordered the guard to throw them out," said the Frenchman, bleakly. "You must have felt like shooting them," I submitted. "I was tempted," agreed the French officer. You see, democratic people always feel humanity mastering them and that is why we must win. I think it is why, in Matthew Halton's phrase, "in the logic of history," we shall win. (Applause—prolonged.)

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON (President of the Empire Club): It is my privilege, representing the

Empire Club, one of the joint hosts at this function, to say how delighted we are at the great success we have had to-day at this luncheon. I am quite sure that every one who has been here feels amply repaid and feels thrilled and impressed by the splendid recital we have just heard from our good friend, Gregory Clark. I think he has brought home to us in a very forceful, realistic and simple way the awful menace that overhangs the world and overhangs this country, in particular, as a part of the British Empire. He has done much, I think, to arouse public sentiment to action in Canada because, after all, it doesn't do to leave activity entirely to groups, to governments, to organizations. There should be effort on the part of every individual, because the threat with which we are faced to-day is not only the destruction, the annihilation of the ideals by which we govern ourselves but it is an attempt to destroy our personal freedom and liberty, our individual rights, and to make us part of a great mass-moving machine with the most bestial sentiments and activities that one can conceive of.

One cannot, as Mr. Clark has said, find words to describe the awful tragedy that is daily transpiring with abandoned and horrible vigour to annihilate the individual who resists their attempt to make the world subject to them.

In Canada we are a liberty-loving people. We are accustomed to making up our own minds, exercising our own judgments, and we are entitled to enjoy the reward of our individual effort. These are the most precious things that humanity has inherited and these are the things that are worth fighting to defend and preserve.

The more doctrine, such as we have heard to-day, is preached, the more realistic and illuminating tales we hear, I am sure, the greater will be the determination of the Canadian people to see to it that we put forth our utmost effort and do our full share in the resistance against the forces of evil. If we fail, the world is chaos. If we fail, life presents no enticing or inviting picture to us or to

others who may become subject to the oppression and tyranny of the victor.

It is a good thing to have Gregory Clark back. He said that people were shot all about him but that no newspaper fellow was hit. Whether that is due to Providence or due to the facility with which the newspaperman artfully dodges everything he wishes to avoid, I am not quite sure. At any rate, we are glad they didn't hit Greg. In spite of the atmosphere in which he has been forced to live, he has grown up to be not only a journalist but a real institution in Canada. People read with interest everything he says. I see people stop and look at him on the street. He is a real, moving, force that everybody admires, and to-day I am quite sure you would like me to say on behalf of all of you, that we are indeed deeply grateful to him for coming and giving us such an interesting and impressive talk about his experiences across the water. (Applause.)

"CANADA AT WAR"

AN ADDRESS BY

THE HONOURABLE C. D. HOWE, B.Sc., M.E.I.C.

MINISTER OF MUNITIONS AND SUPPLY.

Wednesday, September 4, 1940

A Joint Meeting of the Empire Club of Canada and the Canadian Club was held in the Royal York Hotel, Toronto, on Wednesday, September 4, 1940.

MR. A. R. COURTICE: Gentlemen: At the end of one year of war it seemed appropriate that we should have a review of Canada's war effort. No one is in a better position to speak to us on that subject than the Minister of Munitions and Supply, and we are fortunate that in the midst of his very busy life he could be our guest of honour to-day. Mr. Howe is eminently well qualified, both in theory and in practice, for the great public responsibility which he has assumed. He is a graduate Engineer of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and for several years was Professor of Engineering at Dalhousie University before he engaged in private business where he became an acknowledged world expert in the construction of grain elevators. Mr. Howe seems always to have been associated with big projects, both in business and in government, an example of which was the remarkably successful organization and completion of the Trans-Canada Air Service which compares favourably with the best in the world. (Applause.)

As Minister of Munitions and Supply, Mr. Howe is responsible for the purchase of all of Canada's war supplies with the widest possible control over the production of all these central war materials. His Department has spent many millions in the last twelve months on war orders and in the construction and equipment of new plants and new industries. The immediate purpose of this is, of course, to win the war, but also in the process there is being laid the foundation of a new industrial age for Canada. To such great purposes as these Mr. Howe is now devoting all his time and talents in his country's interests.

Gentlemen, it is my pleasure to present to this very large and representative audience, the Honourable C. D. Howe. (Applause.)

THE HONOURABLE C. D. HOWE, B.Sc., M.E.I.C.: Mr. Chairman. Distinguished Guests, Gentlemen: As we enter the second year of the war we may well look back at the year just past and review the progress that has been made toward our war objective. It has been a discouraging year, a year that has seen the armed forces of Germany meet with success after spectacular success. Britain has seen her Allies one by one give up the struggle and become subject to her enemy. Yet, as I stand here to-day, I was never so sure as I am at this moment that Britain will be the ultimate victor. (Applause.) I am sure that everyone within the sound of my voice shares that opinion.

Changing over a country from peaceful pursuits to an "all out" war effort is a task the magnitude of which few can appreciate. A Minister of Munitions and Supply can never fairly be charged with complacency. To him the time factor in converting a requisition into the goods and materials themselves seems interminable. Before a uniform can be made the wool must be procured and the cloth woven. Before a shell can be produced the machinery that makes the shell must be manufactured, and before that, the machinery that makes our machinery must also be manufactured. Before we can make explosives we must build

a huge plant, and to obtain the components that go into explosives we must build several chemical plants, the product of each of which is a necessary raw material. Before we can build aeroplanes we must first manufacture aluminum and convert it into sheets, tubes and forgings. All this takes time, and to one who stands between the demand of the fighting forces on the one hand and production schedules on the other hand, that time seems endless. It is only when we can look back at a full year that we can see that real progress is being made.

There is no time to be lost in our race for armaments. Germany has been on a war footing for seven years, preparing for the present struggle. Her productive capacity was being geared to war throughout that period. She now has at her disposal all the great armament plants of Europe—Krupp, Schneider, Bofors and Skoda. For man-power she can draw on a population of one hundred and twenty million Germans and Italians, and in addition another eighty million conquered men and women who are being forced to work for the Nazis in order to exist. In other words, Germany now controls the lives of two hundred million persons against whom are ranged the eighty-six million of the British race. There is no time to be lost.

One year ago we had forty-five hundred troops available for service overseas or elsewhere. To-day the Canadian Active Service Force numbers over one hundred and fifty-five thousand. A year ago there were no troops outside of Canada. Now, the Canadian Active Service Force is in England, Iceland, Newfoundland, and in the Caribbean, and over one hundred thousand in Canada are available for duty anywhere. Besides this, some sixty thousand volunteers will be training this summer in our militia camps. This winter in addition to the militia training at local headquarters, there will be, each month at the militia training centres, another thirty thousand. This means that until further contingents of the Canadian Active Service Force go overseas there will be on service and in training camps

or headquarters about two hundred thousand men in this country.

The First Canadian Division that went to England some eight months ago has been enlarged into a Canadian Corps, with Major-General McNaughton in command, and now numbers the equivalent of nearly three divisions. A Third Division and a Fourth Division and nine more additional rifle battalions have been formed. Our Army has been reorganized in the light of experience gained overseas in the last few months. Reconnaissance detachments, mobile formations and motorized troops have been formed both here and in England.

One year ago our Navy had seventeen hundred officers and men; now it has nearly ten thousand. A year ago the Royal Canadian Air Force had a personnel of four-thousand men; now its personnel is twenty-five thousand, exclusive of the Air Training Programme. Three squadrons of the Royal Canadian Air Force are operating in the United Kingdom to-day and another squadron of the Royal Air Force is composed wholly of Canadians. You may read of their exploits in the account of many an air battle over England. Canada has been assigned the task of training a large proportion of the pilots that will defend Britain in future years and our Air Training Plan is well ahead of the schedules laid down for it when the programme was undertaken.

I think that we can claim progress in the mobilization of our armed forces. My own responsibility has been that of obtaining munitions and supplies for these forces. It will be particularly appropriate to discuss progress in that direction briefly, but in some detail, on a day that a war loan is being launched as a large portion of that loan will inevitably be used to pay for munitions and supplies.

When the war began the Canadian Navy consisted of fifteen vessels. To-day it consists of one hundred and twenty vessels. In the next year one hundred more will be added. This has involved a \$60,000,000 building programme for the two years, covering the building of mine sweepers, patrol vessels and smaller craft; and the pur-

chase, conversion and armament of merchant ships. In addition, we are building ten patrol vessels for the British Navy. New naval vessels are being launched each week from our sixteen major shipyards, while eighteen smaller shipyards are working to capacity on a small boat programme. Some fourteen thousand men are employed in ship construction and the numbers are still increasing.

Perhaps our most important contribution to Britain's war effort is the Empire Air Training Plan, which is under way and rapidly expanding. This has involved the extension of existing aerodromes and construction of new aerodromes to the number of one hundred and twenty separate projects. The plan originally contemplated a two-year building programme, but the general speeding up of the plan has shortened the construction period to a single year. At the end of 1940, practically all of these aerodromes will have been completed and equipped with hangars, a drill hall, dormitories, dining halls and all the auxiliary buildings that go to make up a complete school. Some sixty million dollars will have been expended in building and paving air fields and in the erection of the necessary buildings. The programme has involved the use of practically all the grading, excavating and paving equipment in Canada, and has put a considerable strain on the resources of the construction industry. In addition, a number of operational airports have been constructed and extended.

Some five thousand aeroplanes are required for this programme and a large proportion of these are being constructed in Canada. From small beginnings our aircraft industry is being developed to sizeable proportions. Last week our factories delivered thirty-five finished aircraft. Eight Canadian aircraft companies have on hand orders totalling some thirty-eight hundred planes, of which some five hundred have been delivered. Early in 1941 we expect to be turning out three hundred and sixty planes per month, or about twelve planes per day, Sundays and holidays included.

As to types of planes, the present production includes

Fleet Primary Trainer, Tiger Moth Trainer, Fleet 60 Advanced Trainer, Norseman, Harvard Trainer, Anson twin-engine trainer; and for fighting planes, Lysander, Hurricane fighter—I might say the Hurricane fighters are being turned out in tremendous volume and our production has been so successful that a new order for six hundred planes has recently come to Canada—the Bolingbroke bomber, Hampden bomber and the Stranraer flying boat.

We are now dependent upon importation of aeroplane engines, propellers and instruments, but arrangements are being made to manufacture these in Canada to meet future requirements. The manufacture of aeroplane engines and propellers is a very complex problem, involving new sources of raw material and a heavy outlay for machine tools. For that reason there has been some delay in placing these projects in hand. We have now advanced the material situation to a point where production is possible and the difficulty of purchasing abroad gives us little option but to provide for Canadian manufacture.

The supply of skilled labour for our aircraft industry is coming chiefly from our universities and technical schools, all of which are conducting special summer and winter courses directed towards increasing the supply. Every aircraft plant is a training school for mechanics and we have every confidence that labour requirements will continue to be met from these sources.

In the production of automotive equipment Canada is leading the world in volume. At present two of our automobile plants are producing about four hundred mechanized units per day. Canada alone has ordered motor vehicles to a total value of \$65,000,000; all these will have been delivered by the end of this year. Great Britain, South Africa, India, Australia and other parts of the British Empire are also large buyers in this market. Canadian motor transport is acknowledged to be the best that has been produced in this war.

The production of Universal Carriers is well advanced, and deliveries will begin before the end of this year. These

will be of Canadian manufacture throughout. The British Mark 111 tank is in process of production, with the objective of thirty tanks per month. A smaller tank that can be produced in large quantity has been developed by our own designing staff and will be in production before the end of this year.

Our gun programme includes the manufacture of Lee-Enfield rifles, Bren machine-guns, Colt-Browning aircraft machine-guns, Smith & Wesson sub-machine-guns, twenty-five pounder quick-firing guns and carriages, 40 mm. Bofors and 3.7 anti-aircraft guns and mountings, two-pounder anti-tank guns and carriages, and 5.5-inch gun Howitzers and carriages. This programme of gun manufacture has in all cases involved the building of new plants. Our largest gun plant is for the manufacture of twenty-five pounder quick-firing guns and carriages and heavy naval guns, and will be in production before the end of this year. This will be one of the largest and most modern gun plants in the British Empire. The Bren gun plant is now delivering guns in substantial quantity and its original capacity is being doubled by plant expansion.

A new plant is being built for the fabrication of aeroplane bombs, while existing plants are tooling up to produce mines, depth charges and a variety of pyrotechnics.

We are producing shells and ammunition in rapidly increasing quantities, including practically every type of shell need in the present war, complete with fuses, gaines, tracers, primers, cartridge cases, copper tubes for driving bands; in fact, everything necessary to complete all types of shells. Orders placed in Canada for shells and components now exceed \$100,000,000.

The production of small arms ammunition is being expanded rapidly. The pre-war capacity of the Quebec Arsenal has been multiplied by six. Privately owned plants are being enlarged and two new plants are under construction. Definite orders for small arms ammunition placed to date total some \$19,000,000. The extensive use of machine-guns in this war has created an insatiable demand for this type of ammunition.

To provide explosives for a shell programme, Canada is building two large, new explosive plants, the first of which will come into production this month; and a third plant is being put in construction. These plants produce TNT, nitro-cellulose powder and rifle cordite. One large shell loading plant will be in production before the end of this year and a second is in process of construction. The total capital investment in explosive plants now under construction will reach about \$60,000,000, exclusive of plants to manufacture the raw materials of explosives.

We are building a plant for the manufacture of secret war devices, such as optical glass, fire-control apparatus, predictors and sound-detecting apparatus, none of which has previously been made in Canada. The processes to be developed in this factory have all been worked out by our National Research Laboratories, to whose inventive genius Canada is indebted for a type of production essential to our munitions programme.

Our engineering division, in addition to its work on buildings for the Empire Air Training Plan, has placed large contracts for hutments for troops, coast-defence fortifications, buildings for new industrial plants and extensions for existing plants, aeroplane overhaul depots and a wide variety of less important projects, with the result that our building industry is working at its highest rate in history.

Our general purchasing division purchases clothing, boots, food and all personal equipment for the armed forces. Its purchases cover everything in large volume that the ordinary householder purchases in small volume, and a great deal more besides. So far it has made a fair job of having the necessary supplies in the right place at the right time, but in so doing an immense amount of detail has been involved. The magnitude of its operations exceeds that of any purchasing department ever organized in this country.

The supply of components for our explosives programme and raw materials for our aircraft and shell programme, has made necessary the building of large plants

for the production of such chemicals as ammonia, ammonium-nitrate, sulphuric acid, hexachlorothane and one or two new chemicals not previously manufactured in the British Empire. These new chemical plants involve an investment of some \$50,000,000. Some \$40,000,000 have been invested in new capacity for the production of aluminum and aluminum products. I may say that capacity came into production last week.

Plans are being made by the British Government to build a new plant to take care of additional requirements for the year 1943, provided hydro-electric power can be assembled in sufficient quantity. Arrangements have been made to build a large plant for the production of magnesium, a metal similar to aluminum, largely used in the aircraft industry. A new plant, and an expansion to an existing plant, are being built for the manufacture of brass. The production of machine tools is being expanded by plant additions and many million dollars' worth of machine tools are being imported. Some thirty Canadian firms are now manufacturing gauges, involving precision workmanship to one ten-thousandths of an inch, and this programme is being further expanded.

This huge programme has created shortages in raw materials, the supply of which we have been accustomed to regard as unlimited. Every stick of dry lumber and timber is urgently required and there is difficulty in maintaining an adequate supply of aeroplane spruce lumber. A shortage of certain types of steel has developed already and will become steadily more acute. Wool and leather involve important supply problems. Non-ferrous metals, such as copper and zinc, and metals used as alloys with steel are difficult to obtain in adequate quantity. Hydro-electric power, which has been a surplus commodity for years and which is an essential source of energy for war time production, is developing a shortage. Petroleum products, which are largely imported, are constituting a severe drain on our supply of American dollars.

In order to mobilize these raw materials and to avoid unnecessary shortages, a Controller with extraordinary

powers has been appointed to deal with each of the products I have named.

To illustrate the activities of these Controllers, I might mention the work of the Timber Controller, who has associated with himself a volunteer staff numbering about fifty. The Timber Controller has made available new sources of aeroplane spruce; has arranged for the purchase and distribution of practically every stick of dry lumber in Canada; has revised building specifications to permit the widest possible use of available lumber; and has taken steps to curtail all unnecessary use of lumber. The Timber Controller observed recently that the motor companies were purchasing large quantities of lumber for building export crates and arranged for the design of a cheaper crate, resulting in the saving of fifteen dollars per unit, which, on the sixty thousand units involved, results in a saving of \$900,000, and the release of a large amount of lumber for other purposes. Each Controller, by an intimate study of the situation for which he is responsible, is bringing about a more efficient use of his product.

From this brief account of our work in obtaining munitions and supplies, you will have appreciated that immense sums of money are involved. Canadian purchases have already passed the three hundred million dollar mark, while British purchases in Canada for war materials, and exclusive of food and lumber, total some \$125,000,000. Munitions plants completed or under construction account for about \$165,000,000 in addition, bringing the total expenditures and commitments made by the Department of Munitions and Supply in the first year of the war to some \$600,000,000. This is, of course, exclusive of payments to our troops at home and abroad and to their dependents, and other expenditures handled directly by the Defence Departments.

The staff of the Department of Munitions and Supply now numbers about six hundred, to which must be added the staffs of eight wholly-owned government corporations which have been formed with the purpose of decentralizing our activities and bringing into the work of the De-

partment a large number of experienced business executives who, while unable to give their full time to the government service, are willing and able to contribute a considerable portion of their time in the direction of government-owned corporate enterprises. A large number of men and women engaged in this work are serving without salary, and many of them are paying their own living expenses while so serving. A very large number of men and women, many of them having outstanding qualifications, have offered their services and for them a suitable task has not been found.

There is, however, one task that is open to every man and woman in Canada, and that is the furnishing of the sums of money necessary to finance our munitions programme. Some eight months ago our Minister of Finance asked for subscriptions to a war loan in amount of \$200,000,000, and the response was magnificent. To-day he is asking for a subscription to a still larger war loan which must be subscribed in full if our war programme can continue to expand.

We are paying for this war by taxation and by borrowing. One of the outstanding evidences of the universal readiness of our people to pay for the war is the way in which our people have shouldered the load of taxation. Look back a year and compare the taxes which the people of this Dominion were paying then as compared with now. Income Tax has increased by as much as three or four times; and not only that, taxes are being paid by people who have never before paid a direct tax to the Federal Treasury. I think that the way in which the people have shown that they can "take it" is nothing short of phenomenal. I do not know what you call it, but I call it "morale". The business man has been hard hit through increased taxes. His rate has nearly doubled, and in addition to that the country taxes 75 per cent of increased profits. Business to-day is being operated largely for the benefit of the government and business men are not complaining that this is so. In this time of war the emphasis has shifted from the individual to the nation and our pur-

pose must be to strengthen and unify the fabric of our citizenship for the supreme task of helping to win the war.

Let us then purchase the new war bonds to the limit of our ability. The bonds are a good investment; certainly the safest investment that can be found. If the experience with the last loan can be repeated with this loan, our enemies can find no comfort in the Canadian situation.

Money is an important factor, but man-hours are even more important. We are building the best of equipment, but this cannot turn out munitions unless there are capable and willing workmen to operate the machines. When France collapsed and the fate of the British Empire seemed to hang in the balance, I called on the workmen of Canada to forego holidays and to work extra hours. The response was nothing short of magnificent. While I realize that our ability to turn out munitions is dependent on the co-operation of Labour, I have no worry on that score. This is every man's war and there are few that fail to appreciate the situation.

A contemporary American historian has recently pointed out the distinguishing characteristics of the British people, as follows:

"They are stern in defence of their rights, but faithful in the performance of their duties. They are critical of their Government, and no nation is more fearlessly critical—but they rally in the defence of the common cause, because duties and rights are to them co-equal and co-extensive—parts of the same thing—necessary to a sane national life."

This determination to defend and to fulfill duties and obligations is part of our Canadian heritage as well. We will accept the responsibilities that accompany the rights we are determined to retain. There are some things that can never die; the greatest of all is faith, faith in the power of humanity to determine its own destiny. It is the faith of free men, and in that faith we will live and work and pay, till victory is assured. (Applause—prolonged.)

MR. R. A. COURTICE: Having heard about some of our activity on the home front it is now our rare privilege to have the opportunity of hearing about some of the activity on the battle front from one of our own boys, a native of Lindsay, who has been on active service with the Royal Air Force since the outbreak of war. Flight Lieutenant Barton has seen a great deal of service. He has been through the Battle of Flanders and the memorable evacuation from Dunkerque, where he merited the award of the Distinguished Flying Cross. I know that we are all tremendously proud to be able to pay our tribute here to one of our own brave young fliers, and that tribute may well be extended to all whom he so splendidly represents, to the Royal Air Force which against such odds has been thrilling the whole British Empire with its magnificent achievements, and to all of our own fighting forces on land and sea, as well as in the air, who voluntarily have gone overseas, prepared to risk their all in the defence of liberty and justice.

Gentlemen, our guest of honour has honoured us today by being here and I am now very proud to be able to introduce to you Flight Lieutenant Wallace Barton. (Loud cheers.)

FLIGHT LIEUTENANT WALLACE BARTON: Well, Gentlemen, while I am called brave and all that, this has made me feel actually rather nervous.

I was very fortunate in that I went to England in the early months of 1937, with the intention of joining the Royal Air Force, and as the result of two or three years' service I happened to be on the front line when war was declared. It is just a year ago now but I will never forget the feeling in the squadron when we knew that at last our chance had come. For years we had been training and we had been held back from something we wanted to get into. At last we knew the hour had come and our chance was at hand. Everyone, from the Commanding Officer down to the mechanics, felt very, very happy, very excited, and the day came when eventually we took off

from England and headed out over the Channel and arrived in France. We had hoped to start fighting the day we got there but we were rather disappointed for during the months of the winter in France we sat around, wondering when it was going to start.

On the morning of the 10th of May the flight of Heinkel bombers signified the beginning. They dropped some bombs on our aerodrome and we knew then that the day had come.

I was sent up into Belgium and went to a small aerodrome near Brussels. The first real vision I had of the war at all was a drifting column of refugees. You have all heard much about the Belgian refugee columns. There have been photographs and no doubt newsreels of them. I am afraid I missed the newsreels and I am almost glad that I did. Nothing you have ever seen is quite like the real thing. I saw a column of refugees jamming a road over fifty miles long—the main road that runs west from Brussels. There were motor cars. The fortunate people who had motor cars were travelling down the road, surrounded by people in waggons, in wheelbarrows, with their goods and chattels, hurrying away from the invaders coming in from the east. They were terrified. They fled at the approach of any aircraft whether it had the red and blue insignia on the side of the fuselage or the well known black cross. Any aircraft was an enemy at that time. They fled and hid in ditches and hedges at the approach of any aircraft. Many times did I see German dive bombers, the now famous Stukas, wreck these columns. Possibly those German pilots were aiming at bridges or crossroads and the unfortunate refugees just happened to be there. Somehow, I rather doubt it!

We got into aerial combat rather at the beginning and when the army to the north of us began to retire and that German column came through into France on the south, we were left on the proverbial spot.

Their pilots are good. Their air squadrons always work very far forward. We work over our own lines and

go behind enemy positions to try to find their organization. We used to make flights and fly for six German fighters at a time. Well, it sounds rather horrible, but they usually got in one another's way. They tried so hard—I will say that for them—but they just got in each other's way. They were just so over-confident that before they knew where they were they suddenly found they were minus one or two of their friends.

We were flying Westland Lysander aircraft. They are very good. I hope to fly nothing better. It is amazing the amount of punishment the British aircraft will stand. They used to get filled with lead and still fly. I have a friend who used to cover every bullet hole in his machine with a little red swastika. Eventually, the Commanding Officer had to stop him. He had so many red swastikas that he was spoiling the camouflage. It was becoming all red and he had to be stopped.

I should like to say a word about the ground crews. They never have the pleasure of actual combat themselves. They are doomed to sit on the ground and keep the aircraft running, but the more difficult things become, the happier they are. When we were working from open fields, with the aircraft just picketed down, they were working all night to get the aircraft serviceable for the morning and they asked nothing better than to be left alone to have the aircraft serviceable. It was a matter of pride with them that never should the squadron be held back because their aircraft were not ready. (Applause.) It was very touching, the pride that they would take in getting that aircraft in the air. I remember one of them, just before I was going up one day, removed his own St. Christopher medal from around his neck and climbing into the cockpit, bound the medal on a little silver chain to the rear sight of my machine-gun and said, "There, I hope, Sir, that will do some good." That was very touching and it looks as though that spirit were going on in the Service at this moment.

Nothing, I say, has bucked up the spirit of the British Army as much as the Battle of France and Flanders.

The infantry did a magnificent job. Our odds were only six to one—to be more or less fair. Their's were ten to one, at least.

I remember that the last morning I was in France the Germans caught up rather quickly and as they were pushing through the woods on the south side of the aerodrome, we had to go. When I last saw one Second-Lieutenant and his small detachment of men, they were getting out of their motor lorries, taking their Bren guns and going forth to meet these tanks. I hope they eventually got back to Dunkerque—I don't know. They were just not beaten. No one was beaten. I saw some of them coming away from Dunkerque and I never saw anyone more loathe to leave a position in my life. They were expressing in very lurid language their opinion of the Germans and everything German—and what they would do when eventually they got back to France. They had their rifles. Their ammunition was gone but they were carrying their arms back with them. There was a great loss of material in the retreat from Belgium, but that was no gain to the Germans. Everything was destroyed. The British Army left nothing behind of any use to another power. (Applause.)

The last trip I had in France was in the evening from Dunkerque. As far as you could see, in every direction, towns and villages were on fire. It made night flying rather easy because there were flames from every quarter of the heavens except the west where the black Channel lay. Flames lit up every quarter of the heavens with a very lurid glow as far as one could see. The oil tanks were burning at Dunkerque and as far east as Amiens the sky was one patch of flames after another as the German Army advanced. The troops that came back from Dunkerque brought that tale with them. They instilled that spirit into England, if it had been lacking before, and from the evacuation of Dunkerque came, I think, one of the greatest boosts to the spirit of England to-day. I left England not very long ago and I can assure you no country in the world is further from being beaten than

England is to-day. Everyone is making an effort. No one is exempt from the law of "we will keep him from our shores".

I say, when a country as fond of sport as England is, will willingly plough up its golf courses to prevent enemy transports from landing there, they really must be serious.

There were many Canadians that I met in France. Some, like myself, had gone over before. I met in England the first squadron, 110 Squadron, of this city. The welcome extended to any Canadian in England is astounding. It seems that a reputation was left for us by the Canadian pilots in the last war. I may say, they make it very difficult for us because they put up such a good show that we are expected to live up to it and it is very difficult to live up to such a record.

Any Canadian is welcome. They say they have no doubts about the Canadians at all, that they can expect from them something rather more than they will get from anyone else. I hope that those Canadian pilots of the last war who are in Canada now will approve of the effort being made by their successors in England and France to-day. (Applause.)

And now I am serving in Canada, at one of the training stations of the Royal Canadian Air Force. I have made many friends here and the spirit is astounding. Everyone wants to be in England now. No one wants to be here at all. They say, "Why are we here? Why can't we go?" That is a splendid spirit. That is just what England expects and that is what they are getting, and I want to say, as I close, I hope that I may have the honour of going back to England some day with the Canadian pilots that I have met here in Canada. (Applause—prolonged.)

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON: (President of The Empire Club): Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: It is my privilege to have the opportunity of expressing the very warm appreciation of this large gathering for the interesting and informative talks we have listened

to, to-day. I am sure Mr. Howe will forgive me if I make reference first to Flight Lieutenant Barton. He spoke of the thrill and the satisfaction that came to him and to the others in the Air Force, but he has no idea of the thrill and the pride that occupied every heart in Canada because of their heroic achievements as partners of the great organization that is endeavouring to prevent the destruction of civilization.

We are glad to have you back, Commander Barton, glad to have the benefit of your experience and knowledge available to those who will have to follow you, as they will in very large numbers. We are very, very grateful to you for coming here to-day.

Now, may I say a word about my friend, Mr. Howe, the man who tosses hundreds of millions of dollars about so nimbly that he seems to have a real job on his hands. I would like to say to him that our people are not concerned so much with the hundreds of millions made available, nor with the taxation we have to bear to maintain this war. What we want is speed and victory. (Applause.) I think every loyal subject in Canada realizes the importance of victory, not only to British arms, but victory for the whole civilized world, because that one little island holds on high to-day the torch that was caught from falling hands and they are the only people in the world who are respecting the admonition that was given by the men that are buried in Flanders and France. They are not fighting alone for themselves. They are fighting alone to save the world and they are entitled to expect the greatest possible support at least from the various sections of the Empire. We have a duty to Great Britain. If one looks back over history since the earliest days, one cannot but realize that our proud position, the possibilities for development and expansion, the great opportunities that are provided in this country for men willing to work, have been accorded us, have been secured to us by the British people. (Applause.)

Our friends to the south of us say that their first line of defence is in the British Channel and the North Sea

and we realize, as they do, that our existence for many years and our prosperity in an economic way, has been entirely dependent upon the protection we have had from a Navy provided by the taxpayers of Great Britain.

I am sure, Mr. Howe, there is not a loyal citizen in this country—and if there are any disloyal they should be interned—there is not a loyal citizen in this country but what will endorse the utmost effort you make to provide the maximum of support for the armies that fight for our own protection, our own liberty and security.

It has been a great privilege to have Mr. Howe here to-day. (Applause.) In a very business-like way he has given us some idea of the scope and the enormity of the task he has in hand and the burden he has assumed. Hundreds of millions? Yes, if it will assure victory, Canada is prepared to be taxed to the very limit. And when we talk about taxation, Gentlemen, look at the record across the sea and see what it means in the little, foggy, hidden island, what they are paying, not for themselves alone but for the cause that we hold dear, as they do—the very high principles that govern civilization and which actuate the life of the people in the various parts of the Empire.

Mr. Howe says he is sure of victory and he should know something of the situation, of what conditions are and what the outlook is, from his position in a sister government. Sure of victory? I never had the slightest doubt of it in the world and I rely upon the spirit and the character of the people who are standing up for righteousness against the attack of the evil one.

We are grateful indeed to you, Mr. Howe, for coming here to-day. All I can say to you is: "Speed up your effort; produce as quickly as you can; supply everything you think is necessary and Canadians will gladly pay the bill."

What would life be worth if we were not permitted to live under conditions and be guided by principles which we now enjoy? What would life be worth if the little island across the sea were destroyed or overrun by the

barbarian baby killers, slaughtering ruthlessly in an effort to terrorize the world. One cannot contemplate because one cannot have any conception of the situation that would follow. All the world is alarmed about it to-day. The war is not over but victory is assured and with that end in view we are willing to pay, pay, pay, and our boys are willing, in the tens and hundreds of thousands, to fight, fight, fight. We will bear our full share in a glorious cause that will save to the world the right to live, to exercise individual judgment, to enjoy the fruit of our own genius and our own labour, the right to talk and speak and worship as our conscience and our judgment may dictate. All these things are the most precious things in life to-day and we are fighting to preserve them. No effort should be spared.

We have now the co-operation of our friends to the south of us. (Applause.) We are to have an examination and a report made by a Joint Commission which, after exercising the best judgment, will say just what is necessary to protect from invasion this North American continent. I don't suppose that we will have any economic union. But I do think the fight is being made on their behalf just as much as ours and it is due and proper that they should feel a sense of their responsibility and co-operate in destroying the enemy.

They will give us all the supplies and all the help they can—and we will get priority over the ordinary business orders. That will be a great help to us in our effort.

I congratulate you, Mr. Howe, for you have shown us that you have in you the courage, aye, the stuff that men are made of. (Applause.)

“AUSTRALIA”

AN ADDRESS BY

MAJOR-GENERAL THE HONOURABLE SIR
THOMAS WILLIAM GLASGOW, K.C.B.
C.M.G., D.S.O., V.D.

AUSTRALIAN TRADE COMMISSIONER IN CANADA.

Chairman: The President, The Honourable G. Howard
Ferguson.

Thursday, September 12, 1940

A Joint Meeting of the Empire Club of Canada and the Canadian Club was held in the Royal York Hotel, Toronto, on Thursday, September 12, 1940.

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON: Gentlemen: Our guest to-day, Sir William Glasgow, is by no means unknown in Canada. He has visited us before—some years ago—and he came here again recently in an official capacity. In 1928 I had the pleasure of meeting Sir William when he came here as a member of the Parliamentary Association and, while not coming in contact with him, I have heard a great deal about him since that time.

Sir William has had a very remarkable career and—modest as most politicians are—you hear very little about it. Not only has he had a remarkable career but it has been greatly varied. As a young man he went into business and made some progress, so much that the Bankers Association got their eye on him and took him into the banking business. Shortly after that he went to South Africa where he distinguished himself as an officer in the Australian Force in the South African War. He was created a Companion of the Distinguished Service Order, was decorated with the Queen's Medal, and was

mentioned in despatches a great number of times. But his heart went back to Australia—perhaps it never left Australia. He went back there and went into the ranching business. He stuck to that for a time, until his country called him again, when he went to the Great War, in command of the Queensland Division of the Australian Army. Again he showed remarkable qualities and was decorated a number of times. He was awarded the Croix de Guerre and a number of other important decorations.

When he returned to Australia he was elected to the Senate of the Australian Parliament, where he served for eleven or twelve years, when his country called again and he is now on a mission to spread the gospel of Australia throughout the British Empire. No greater Imperialist have I ever met than Sir William Glasgow. No man, I am sure, will find a warmer welcome during his stay in this country than Sir William Glasgow. He was good enough to say he would come here again. I propose we bring him here as frequently as we can. No man could be more popular and highly regarded in the City of Toronto than the man who reflects so strongly the things that we all feel here—the desire to uphold the hands of freedom and security and justice through the maintenance of the closest possible connection with the old Mother Country. (Applause.) Sir William is a very ardent advocate of that course. Perhaps that is one of the chief reasons that I like him. I now have very great pleasure in asking him to address us. (Applause.)

SIR WILLIAM GLASGOW, K.C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O., V.D.: Mr. President and Gentlemen: It is quite true, as the President tells you, that this is not my first visit to Canada, nor was the occasion on which I came here in 1928 the first occasion on which I had associated with Canadians. Away back in 1899 I found myself associated with Canadians in South Africa. In fact, my earliest recollection of life at the front is when I was in a camp on the Cape, at a place called

Belmont, and in the same camp there was a Canadian Infantry Battalion, commanded by Colonel Odlum. I became associated there with some of the young Canadian officers and I can assure you on that occasion I had close and friendly association with those officers.

Then again during the last war, in 1916, I happened to hand over a sector of the line in France to a Canadian Brigade and we Australians shared with the Canadians the great honour of being the spear-head of the great counter attack that brought about the downfall of the German Army. My association with Canadians, both in South Africa and France was one of closest co-operation and friendship, and I can assure you we all thought it a very great honour, as Australians, to be associated with Canadians.

Now, I am going to talk to you about Australia and give a couple of instances of the way in which Australia faces any great problem which arises. About three months ago the Australian Prime Minister, Mr. Menzies, said these words:

"Every good thing that we have is now at stake, our own freedom here in Australia where for so many years we have felt security in our very loneliness; the safety and independence of the Mother Country; the continued existence of the British Empire; the continuance of those institutions of self-government under which men are free men and not the slaves of a machine.

"For the time being we must put our dreams away; our dreams of greater social security, of more prosperity, of less work and more pay, of peace and quietness. Some day we will dream once more of these things, and our dreams will come true. But at this solemn hour, action is what counts. Sacrifice—all-round sacrifice; unremitting toil; unflinching devotion—these are the things which we must have."

So many speeches have been made in the last year that one might be tempted to think that this was hollow rhetoric and that the Australian people would continue to idle complacently along their way. Or, again, those who are

bitterly conscious of graft and class distinction might be prompted to question whether the Unions would be willing to subordinate themselves to the Government and employers in the interest of increased production and whether those at the helm would themselves make voluntary sacrifices.

I know from personal and official information reaching me constantly that they were not empty words and I am convinced that when the occasion demands, my people can sink their differences, make great sacrifices and use every method ingenuity can devise to overcome their difficulties.

In 1914, Australia as a nation faced the greatest challenge in her history. She accepted the challenge, pledged herself to the last man and the last shilling, and all factions became merged into one party co-operating harmoniously for the common purpose of winning the war.

In 1929, the nation was beset once more by a crisis, this time one of a different kind—a severe and nation-wide economic depression which was only part of a world depression. The story of events preceding that crisis, and the manner in which the depression was tackled so successfully that Australia recovered from it before any other country, throw a great deal of light on the character of the Australian people and will give you some idea of the extent to which they will apply themselves and make sacrifices now. For that reason, I propose to tell it to you briefly.

Perhaps Australians have an innate ability to muddle through in economic matters just as the British are reputed to be able to muddle through in international affairs. Most of them would, I think, admit that in many respects luck was with the country as it climbed out of the depression, but they also consider that they adopted sensible measures, both before and during it, which made it possible to share evenly those sacrifices which were essential for recovery. Before 1929, particularly drastic steps were taken to revise the Commonwealth Constitution and financial organization, and so pave the way for a sound economy when it was most needed.

I shall give you an account of these steps, because they involve problems which Canada has faced or will probably face, problems for the study of which the Royal Commission on Dominion-Provincial Relations was, a short time ago, set up here.

At the outset I should explain that the Australian Constitution is modelled on lines similar to that of the United States; that is to say, when it was drawn up in 1900 it defined specifically the powers of the Commonwealth Government and left the residual powers in the hands of the six State Governments. This system, you will observe, is the direct opposite to that laid down by the Constitution of the Dominion of Canada where the powers of the Provincial Governments are specifically defined and the residual powers rest with the Dominion Government.

Although Australia was, at the time of the last Great War, essentially a primary producing country, industries were gradually being established—to a large extent with the help of imported British capital. For this reason, and because the State Governments had also been borrowing for public works, debts had been steadily rising. War borrowing increased the figures to such disturbing proportions that the Federal and State Governments recognized the necessity for some control over borrowing, especially overseas.

The Commonwealth Government, as early as 1924, invited the State Governments to co-operate with it with a view to preventing undue competition and clashing in raising loans, and a Loan Council, consisting of the Commonwealth and State Treasurers, was formed. This Council decided that borrowing in the United States and borrowing simultaneously in the United States and London, on behalf of the Commonwealth and the States, should be conducted solely by the Commonwealth.

The work of the Loan Council in trying to instill some order into the Commonwealth's finances only served to accentuate other financial matters which needed regulating.

Provision had been made in the Commonwealth Constitution for the Federal Government to take over certain of

the public debts of the States and possibly the whole of the indebtedness of each State. It was largely with a view to fixing and settling this responsibility of the central government that a Premiers' Conference was convened in 1927. At the Conference an understanding, since known as the "Financial Agreement", was reached, whereby the Commonwealth took over the unpaid balance of the gross public debts of each State and all other debts of each State existing in 1929 for money deemed to have been borrowed for and on behalf of the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth was to contribute for fifty-eight years for interest charges on such debts and to a sinking fund to extinguish them in that period. Future debts, to be raised after the Agreement, were to be covered by the establishment of a sinking fund to which the Commonwealth and States would each contribute one dollar per cent per annum. Lastly, it was decided that all future borrowing on behalf of either the Commonwealth or State Governments should be arranged by the Commonwealth according to the decision of the Loan Council.

It should not be difficult to see that the Financial Agreement represented a definite tightening up of the whole Australian financial system and started a systematic saving which was to prove so valuable in the rainy days which lay just ahead.

The fall of world prices for primary products brought quick repercussions in Australia. First the primary producers, who were the backbone of the economy, became impoverished and could not buy from Australian manufacturers and importers and, secondly, the overseas supply of credit to finance Australian industries and public works was cut short.

Conditions degenerated at such a pace that, at the invitation of the Commonwealth Government, Sir Otto Niemeyer, of the Bank of England, visited Australia and counselled severe deflation. Thereupon, the Prime Minister and State Premiers met to draw up a plan to ease the economic situation.

The Labour Premier of New South Wales, Mr. Lang, proposed the reduction of interest on internal loans, the cessation of oversea interest payments pending agreement for a similar reduction and the substitution for the gold standard of a "currency based on the wealth of Australia".

The others at the Conference rejected Mr. Lang's proposals and adopted instead a plan combining all the possible remedies in such a way that the burden fell as equally as possible on everyone, and no considerable section of the people was left in a privileged position. Five courses of action were adopted simultaneously. These were:

First, a reduction of 20 per cent was made in all adjustable Government expenditure, including all emoluments, wages, salaries and pensions paid by the Government. This reduction of wages rapidly became general for all Australian employees.

Second, internal debts began to be converted.

Third, additional revenue was secured by increased Commonwealth and State taxation.

Fourth, banks reduced their rates of interest on deposits and advances, and last, relief was offered to those saddled with private mortgages.

Before the details of the Premiers' Plan were settled, the Leaders of the Opposition in the Commonwealth Parliament were invited to attend a Conference. After full discussion, the following resolution was passed and published:

"The Conference, including the Leaders of the Opposition in the Federal Parliament, having most carefully considered the financial position of the Commonwealth and the States, and recognizing the national inability to meet existing Government charges, is unanimously of the opinion that to prevent national default in the immediate future, and a general failure to meet Government payments, all expenditure, including interest on Government securities and other interest, and expenditure upon governmental salaries and wages, pensions, and other social services must be substantially reduced.

"These measures, drastic as they may appear, are the first essentials to the restoration of prosperity and the reemployment of our workless people.

"The necessary sacrifice is due to national inability to pay, and it must, therefore, be shared by all.

"The Conference has accordingly provided a conversion plan under which bond-holders may make their contribution to the general sacrifice by themselves accepting the lower rate of interest which the existing position makes unavoidable.

"The Conference therefore appeals to all sections of the people to recognize the position, and, in the interests of the nation, to accept the sacrifices which are involved."

The Central, or Commonwealth Bank, at first unpegged the Australian pound and allowed it to depreciate until it found its natural level and then pegged it at £125 Australian to £100 sterling, which is the present par rate.

It was most important that the London funds should be fed, for it was from them that interest obligations on external loans and import debts were paid. The Government encouraged the search for gold in Australia by raising the price and released gold from bank reserves for shipment to London by decreeing that part of banks' reserves could be held in English sterling instead of gold.

It may be of interest to you to know that the Australian Government recently passed an Act under which there is a complete remission of Federal taxes to gold mines where the cost of production per ounce exceeds \$32.22.

Both interest and external loans were successfully converted and the Commonwealth Bank reduced its rate for advances. The hours of work were reduced in some industries by order of the Commonwealth Arbitration Court.

None of these measures, however, helped the wheat grower, who was in the worst plight. A Wheat Commission was therefore set up which recommended that overseas sales should be supervised and the growers aided by

bounties and subsidies, to be paid for by a new home consumption price for wheat.

Finally, to ensure that the sacrifice was shared similarly by the States as well as by individuals, a Grants Commission was appointed by the Commonwealth Government to examine the economic disabilities suffered by the smaller States through federation and to recommend annual compensatory grants to them.

These measures restored confidence in the country both at home and abroad. New credits were loaned for defence programmes, industries and public works. Happily, the price of wool, Australia's greatest export commodity, rose steadily all this time and the Commonwealth was able to set vigorously about the task of building up the balanced economy that exists to-day.

It was difficult to detect traces in Australia ten years afterwards of the ordeal through which she had been. There was one indelible scar, however. In the financial year 1927-28 about \$35,000,000 were spent for defence purposes, but with the general reduction of estimates this amount fell to about \$18,000,000 by 1930. All branches of the defence forces were seriously affected and the practice of compulsory military service had to be abandoned. Yet, in all this gloom, there was one bright spot. The Government managed to keep the small arms, clothing, munitions and ordnance factories going with skeleton staffs so that when we were faced with the crisis in 1938 we were in a position, although somewhat cramped through shortage of trained personnel, to start on the immediate production of most of the materials and armaments our troops required. Since the outbreak of war, other factories have been established with amazing speed and the Government expects soon to be able to produce all the food and munitions the Australian forces will require and, in addition, augment the supplies of these which she is already shipping to Great Britain. (Applause.)

The united spirit shown in the emergency of the depression was revealed again at the outbreak of the present war. When in the House of Representatives, last June,

the Prime Minister moved the second reading of the National Security Bill, his motion was seconded by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Curtin. That Labour should have seconded such a motion was significant enough in itself, but Mr. Curtin took that opportunity to sum up his party's view on the whole situation. Referring to the Bill, he said: "We have at stake self-government in Australia; we also have at stake a trusteeship for the future, and for the soil on which we live." In order to assure the safety of the country, he said the Labour Party had decided that "the entire resources of Australia, which include all productive and financial organizations, should be placed under the control of the Commonwealth Government for national service." "Labour," he continued, "knew that in arriving at that decision it was giving to the Government, power over life and death, over industrial conditions and over property and persons. It knew that this amounted substantially to making the Executive of the Australian nation the equivalent of absolute government of Australia."

I am sure that the unity of purpose and spirit of sacrifice which is becoming increasingly evident in Australia is equally strong here in Canada and in the other parts of the British Commonwealth of Nations. How then can Nazi Germany hope for the crumpling of the Commonwealth's resistance that Hitler optimistically forecast in his speech last week? Such boasting as his can only be the product of uneasiness and uncertainty of mind.

While the German propaganda machine was trying to persuade the world and itself that, if the German hordes marched on Poland, the Dominions would decide they had no quarrel in Europe and watch developments there with an indifferent eye, anyone who happened to be reading Arthur Conan Doyle's *The White Company*, written in 1891, might have gauged the true position from these last two prophetic sentences of his book: "The sky may darken and the clouds may gather, and again the day may come when Britain may have sore need of her children,

on whatever shore of the sea they be found. Shall they not muster at her call?"

That is exactly what has happened. The whole British Commonwealth has mustered to the call and already we have seen ample evidence of the sacrifices which we British people are ready to make and must make if we are to be able to restore sanity to the world.

There can be little doubt that Hitler, and Mussolini too, confidently anticipated that if they could terrorize the French into submission by treachery, propaganda and a sudden massed onslaught, they could count on the collapse of British resistance. In this, as in so many other things, they showed a complete misunderstanding of the British spirit and of the cause for which we are fighting. Now, at last, the Nazis must realize the vastness of the British Commonwealth, the unity and tenacity of its peoples. Certainly Australia's determination to continue the fight, no matter what reverses we may suffer, should be clear, for about three months ago, when our prospects were darkest, Mr. Menzies threw out this challenge to Germany: "Whatever calamity may happen elsewhere, the nation that wants to conquer us must come and take us. We don't come from the surrendering breed." (Applause.)

To the people of Australia the course that lies before them is clear and they know there can be no short cuts. Their watchword is "All in"—all in with everything they have, their savings, their property, their skill, the service of their hands, if necessary the service of their lives. (Applause.)

MR. R. A. COURTICE (President of the Canadian Club): Mr. Chairman, Sir William: We have listened to your address on Australia. It is highly desirable that the members of the British Commonwealth should become better acquainted and to that end your address has made a splendid contribution. On behalf of the Empire and Canadian Clubs I sincerely thank you, and may I couple with that the wish that your stay in this country and that of Lady Glasgow, may be a very happy one. (Applause.)

"THE OLD COUNTRY CARRIES ON"

AN ADDRESS BY

SIR EVELYN WRENCH, C.M.G.

Chairman: The President, The Honourable G. Howard Ferguson.

Thursday, September 19th, 1940

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON: Gentlemen: I have the peculiar pleasure to-day of inviting an old personal friend to talk to us—a real Irishman, a thorough-bred, born in the County of Fermanagh. If you can get any better than that, I ask you where. Sir Evelyn Wrench isn't entirely unknown in this country. His activities since his very young days have been varied and energetic and he has become an international figure in the world of British international interests.

Sir Evelyn is a graduate of Eton. After leaving Eton, with his artistic taste and genius, he began to print postcards for a living and he was one of the pioneers of the picture postcard business in Great Britain. He then went into journalism. His merit was recognized by the leading men of the press in Great Britain, and Lord Northcliffe took him on, or rather, he took on Lord Northcliffe and was with him for fourteen years doing very special work. After the death of Lord Northcliffe, he acted as private secretary to Lord Rothermere, the first Air Minister. One can understand the importance of a position of that kind when I tell you that there are three newspapers in London—*The Mail*, *The Express* and *The Herald*, all of which have a circulation from two million to two and a half million.

In 1922, Sir Evelyn had become connected with *The Spectator* and succeeded Mr. St. Loe Strachey as Chairman of the Board.

During all this busy life he has found opportunity for diversion in the organization of various groups and societies that could be made use of as a genesis to interest others in a similar class of work. He is responsible for the Overseas League, which has very large headquarters in the centre of London. As he travelled about, he found it might be wise if he were able to gather together, more closely, English-speaking people, not with a view to antagonizing or ostracizing people of any other nationality or speech, but believing that people who had a common bond of speech if brought together would be a tremendous influence. Thus he founded the English-speaking Union in 1918. It is in connection with his work in the Overseas League and the English-speaking Union that Sir Evelyn Wrench has come to Canada again, and I have no doubt he will be just as successful on this visit as he has been in former times. I thought it would be interesting if we had an opportunity of hearing just what he is doing. I might tell you very confidentially that he was narrow in his views until recent years. He got married over three years ago and he has broadened out considerably. I think we will have a very interesting talk from Sir Evelyn. I have very great pleasure indeed in presenting to you Sir Evelyn Wrench. (Applause.)

SIR EVELYN WRENCH, C.M.G.: Mr. Ferguson, Gentlemen: It is a very great pleasure to be back in Toronto. I almost feel that it is a second home town. I have known Toronto for thirty-four years and have loved it ever since my first visit in 1906. It is extraordinary to think of all the things that have happened since I was last here in November 1937. Mr. Ferguson was quite correct. I only married early in 1937 and I can't compete with my two neighbours. Mr. Ferguson, I think, married forty-four years ago, and Mr. McLaughlin, I think, only forty-one.

I believe the theme on which I am to speak to you is "The Old Country Carries On." That is a very marvelous theme and I don't think anyone could be worthy of it. Just before dealing with that subject I should like to say one or two words about how tremendously I have been struck this time in Canada—I think it is my eighth or ninth visit—by the spirit of unity in the country. The last time, I went away with a rather heavy heart. I felt a great deal of sectionalism in various parts of the country. Sometimes I thought people were thinking more of sectional interests than the unity of Canada and the Commonwealth. That certainly isn't my feeling to-day. I am a tremendous believer on the future of Canada, but one of the things that impressed me most in 1937, I think, was that all the early enthusiasm I remembered on my previous trips across Canada to the coast seemed to have vanished three years ago.

Only this morning, I was thinking of the first time I met Sir Wilfrid Laurier and, talking of the future, he used that phrase you all remember so well, "The twentieth century belongs to Canada". I haven't heard that phrase so often in recent years. I do believe, however, that the twentieth century partially belongs to Canada because I think she has one of the greatest roles to perform in acting as a bridge, just as important in the realm of ideas as the wonderful bridges in San Francisco harbour, in uniting the old world and the new. It is a very wonderful task to carry out.

I think after the war there will be a great immigration to this country. Sometimes in England we forget there is such a place as Canada. We are remembering and thanking God on our knees that there is a Canada to-day. We are remembering that the great air effort on which you are concentrating and which I hope to describe to English listeners across the Atlantic over the British Broadcasting Corporation from New York on Monday.

Now, Mr. Ferguson asked me what theme I would speak on when he wrote, and I wish to say how honoured

I am that he should be taking the Chair to-day. No Canadian was more beloved in all parts of the Old Country than Mr. Ferguson. (Applause.) He referred to my Irish origin. Well, I find I was born quite close to the home of Mr. McLaughlin's ancestors in County Fermanagh, where the people are fifty per cent one thing and fifty per cent the other. I assure you, as far as Ulster is concerned, we are a hundred per cent with the British Commonwealth, and it may interest you to know that the two leading Generals in the British Army at the present time—Sir John Dill and Alan Brooke—are both Ulster men. So Ulster is rather proud of itself at this moment. As an Irishman who does believe in the unity of Ireland, I cannot help being rather saddened by the attitude of some of the people living in Southern Ireland, a country I know intimately. I feel at the moment they are hypnotized, in that unfortunate little country, by what happened in France. But there is no such thing as neutrality in Europe at the present time—only slavery and subservience to the doctrines of anti-Christ, if the British Commonwealth doesn't win. Thank God, it is going to win. (Applause.)

Now, when I sent suggestions of themes for to-day's address to Mr. Ferguson, one of them was "The Old Country Carries On". Somehow I felt he would choose that theme.

I left London with my wife just a month ago. In one sense, of course, it was with relief that we first saw the cliffs of the new world as we passed through the Straits of Belle Isle after a rather unpleasant journey. We had a thousand children on board and we had come through submarine-infested waters. Naturally, one was very delighted to see the new world, and the first time I saw lights at night was from the deck of the "Duchess of Atholl", as we passed Three Rivers on our way up to Montreal. It is a wonderful sensation to be able to have your window open at night and leave the lights on. It would be affectation to say that one was not relieved to be here in North America. Nevertheless it is a very painful thing to be

away from that wonderful little island at this time. We all feel it is the place we ought to be and we hope to go back about March when I finish my American lecture tour.

You, Sir, (Mr. McLaughlin) were talking about Kipling to-day. No one but a Kipling could speak adequately about what is happening in that little island. Perhaps, because I was born in Ireland, I may be allowed to look at England partially from the outside. Having been born in Ireland I think I can see England from the outside. That little country, I know and most of you know, is going through deep, deep places, deep experiences. We are going through a long tunnel and can only see the light on the far horizon. But there is something in that little country and, when the history of this extraordinary age in which humanity has struck its tents and is on the march and no one knows where the march is going to end up, when the story or epic of the little island is written, it will indeed require the words of a Kipling, of a Chaucer or of a Shakespeare.

There is unity in the little island such as it never had before. This is not a war carried on by the intellectuals or by the upper class, "the haves" as opposed to the "have-nots." This war is being carried on by the British people, the ordinary folk of England. Talk to the bus drivers, to the men working in the machine factories, to those running-railway trains, to those in every walk of life, and you will find that they are all a hundred per cent behind this cause. They feel that a great crisis, *the* great crisis in the world's history has arrived, when the decision must be for all the things we hold dear as opposed to the alternative of a world ruled by selfishness and all things evil. That crisis is upon us, and I do think I am not exaggerating the spirit of the Old Country when I tell you they are really, really not thinking in terms of personal advantage or personal fate. From the King and Queen down to the humblest individual, all are pulling their weight, trying to help in every way they possibly can.

Now, just for an instant I want to talk about this

question of waiting. I have lived in London for a year since the war started so I do understand what it means. During that year all the defence programmes, the Air Raid Precaution Services were built up, and week after week and month after month, we had to have all fire stations equipped, all Red Cross stations equipped by male and female personnel. It was most boring. Hundreds and thousands of hospital beds had to be kept in readiness, without a soul in them. The nurses and staffs had to be there. There is nothing more boring in life than waiting with a fear that something dreadful is going to happen and having nothing to do. When you are worried, what you want to do is work hard. All these people in the various civilian services and anti-fire and all the rest of it were doing nothing for days and months.

Then when the test came it showed how much we owed to the way in which that system was organized. Any of you who have been in London wouldn't recognize London lately. We are a city of sand-bags and forts and barbed wire. If you want to go from Buckingham Hall to the Admiralty you will see a fort of machine-guns. If you walk to the Admiralty across the Horse Guards Parade to the Foreign Office, you will pass two lines of barbed wire entanglements and show your identification card.

All through the winter there was the depression of the blackouts. It is a very depressing thing to live continually in blackness. You wouldn't believe it, but the first time I walked out on a winter evening in Piccadilly I literally did not know where I was, although I know that part of London very intimately. It is an extraordinary sensation. At night if you want fresh air you open your windows and turn out the light, but if you suddenly want to see what time it is or to read, you must remember not to switch on the light. You live with the bath full of water in case of an emergency in which the water supply breaks down. On the landing there are buckets of sand and water, and a stirrup pump is on every floor. We all have instructions as to how to detect different types of bombs.

It has very often been said that the Old Country cannot organize, but I want to emphasize that certainly the way in which the civilian population were taught methods of protection and anti-fire drill has been most marvellous. As far as food is concerned we have had little to suffer. Our greatest hardship was to have only one lump of sugar for our coffee and a small pat of butter. There are meatless days and all that, but nothing really serious. Paper rationing has been a privation, though I am not sure, now when I come to the new world again, that I don't rather envy London and England its six-page newspapers.

I am telling these things to show the state of readiness we lived in. Each night we put out our clothes and all the things we want before going to bed, ready to dress in a few minutes and go off to the air-raid shelter. I dressed in three minutes once. And what a motley crew were there. There were some Canadian nurses, Australian soldiers, business men in pyjamas, but the camaraderie of the air shelter is really rather wonderful. You talk to everyone, and there is a feeling that all are in this together.

I can't tell you exactly what has happened in England during the last two or three weeks. Things have been so terrible. The lack of sleep is really the chief danger that London is suffering from at the moment. The morale is splendid but lack of sleep is a terrible thing to face as they are facing it to-day. At any rate, it is all part of the war of nerves.

The past year, for most of us, is more or less divided into two parts—pre-Narvik and post-Narvik. Pre-Narvik was the "phoney" war, as it was called by the American press. All that time we were always waiting for something to happen. Well informed correspondents in the various European capitals kept continuously warning us of the dire happenings in store for us on certain dates. I think the spirit in London a month ago was that there would be no blitzkrieg—anyhow, no mass bombing. "Wolf, Wolf" had been cried so often that they hardly believed it would come. Of course it has come. I don't

know the inner secrets of government. Of one thing I am quite sure: whatever happens, even if London has to be evacuated to a certain extent (it has been as regards children and certain industries), even if London has to be evacuated and governmental institutions dispersed over the country, the Old Country will still carry on. (Applause.)

As you know, Mr. Chamberlain, in the first six or seven months of the war, was Prime Minister. I want to say a word on his behalf. I find, very often, that people now criticize him very severely and more or less hold him responsible for everything that has happened. Mr. Chamberlain is a very conscientious man and did his utmost for peace. Once he felt that war was inevitable he did throw his whole weight into a campaign of preparedness and if the British Navy was in a state of readiness last September, a year ago, I do want to just say this: Mr. Chamberlain was also one of those responsible for those decisions and he gave of his utmost. He was a man of sixty-nine years of age and he never rested and never thought of himself. I don't believe that Mr. Churchill has a more loyal follower to-day than Neville Chamberlain.

Now, about Mr. Churchill. In our country, in our island story, I think Providence must take an interest. I, personally, believe he does and the time produces the man. Undoubtedly, in Winston Churchill we have one of the greatest leaders of the English-speaking world in the past century. He has twofold advantages. He has served the Crown in almost every position of importance. As you know, he was First Lord of the Admiralty when the last war broke out. He has been Chancellor of the Exchequer and Secretary of State for Home Affairs. He has a tremendous sense of the dramatic. I think probably he is one of the few Englishmen who really can meet Hitler with all the initiative and daring and determination that that requires, and who is able to stand up to Hitler's threats, knowing that he is serving the greatest cause that man was ever asked to serve. (Applause.)

In the last war Churchill was largely responsible for the development of tanks. He has got a flair, an initiative, and with that he has got very fine executive ability and, of course, since he has been at the head of affairs in the Old Country there has been a different spirit, from the highest to the lowest. Another of Mr. Churchill's great advantages is that he commands the allegiance of Labour. Every member of the Labour Party believes in him tremendously, and at this time you can imagine what that means. He has also a great knowledge of war, and I think the combination of his imaginative statesmanship, plus the technical knowledge of leading military and air experts is a very strong one.

Then, there are Churchill's speeches. I am sure you hear him. I want to say how tremendously moving it is to be in Canada at this time and hear how the Old Country's calls are also Canada's calls, and nothing happens to the Old Country but you feel it as much as we do. I know you have shared in the great experience of the critical moment when the old world seemed to be toppling over us, and Churchill, with a realization of the deep places we have got to go through, never minimized the danger, the blood and tears and sweat, at the same time inspiring the nation with his dogged determination that we are not going to give in, despite whatever tactics or whatever steps the Nazis care to take. That is the spirit you have in England to-day. As a result, in the new Britain there is unity from the duke to the dustman. They are all in it together and they are not thinking of personal advantage.

Now, for a moment, I should like to ask you to remember what this little island has meant to the world. When the history of the first one thousand years before Christ and the two thousand years after Christ comes to be written, I don't suppose there will be a more soul-stirring epic than the story of that little island which you could drop in your Great Lakes without noticing its absence. What that little island has stood for in the world! Heaven knows it has made lots of mistakes. I

am not here to excuse them. We have not dealt adequately with the unemployment problem in the past. Please God we shall in the future. There has been too much class distinction and many other bad things. But for a moment I am here to ask you to look at the other side of the picture—at the time of Magna Charta, seven hundred years ago, at the first stirrings of human liberty, perhaps since the Greek age, when rights were granted. And gradually you have the upward story of the Mother of Parliaments by which freedom became absolutely inherent in English-speaking civilization. Then the little island established the great Commonwealth on this continent. Although I am partially Irish and partially Scottish, to-day I want to emphasize the fact that the original establishment of the United States was very largely an English achievement. From the counties of England they came. Look at the early names and study the history of the men who went out on the "Mayflower" and who went to Virginia. Read the original Virginia Charter.

I was in Jamestown three years ago and I visited a place that was a moving sight—the place where the first free Parliament met on this continent. It was largely an English achievement and at the time of the American Revolution, as you know, a very large percentage of the population, over 80 per cent, were from the British Isles. What were the men who created the United States? They were not some new breed of men—they were transplanted Englishmen on this continent. Benjamin Franklin's father was a shoemaker from Northampton. Lincoln's forebears came from the Old Land, as did Washington's, and so on. If I had the time to go through the record you would see that most of the founders of the American Republic were of English origin, with English blood stirring in their veins. English blood has got to be free. You couldn't control from Downing Street, four thousand miles away, those who had imbibed that milk of liberty from the days of childhood.

So the great British Commonwealth has been built up.

It isn't only an English-speaking Commonwealth. It is a Commonwealth of those of English, French and Dutch speech. It is the greatest political institution devised by man. It enables great countries such as Britain, Canada and Australia to have complete local independence and also to co-operate for the common good. It doesn't say to the man who doesn't speak our English language, "You shan't be free", but it says, "Come in and be free with us." As a result, to-day in South Africa, as you know, one of the great statesmen of the world has been leading the South African people in the present war—General Smuts, a Dutchman who was fighting against us forty years ago. That is the kind of freedom the British Commonwealth stands for.

What would happen if Hitler or Mussolini or Stalin or Japan controlled the world? I think that in an interview I gave to the press the other day I said if George III had been a Hitler what happened on this continent would not have happened. Why have the countries of this continent grown to greatness with their own free institutions since 1805? I am glad to say it is realized now that it is because the British Navy kept Europe from putting her nose into the affairs of this continent. The then infant United States, small in numbers, was able to develop its great natural resources free from outside interference because the British Fleet would permit no intruder to cross the ocean.

I have read speeches, in the last week, by American leaders, paying a tribute to the British Fleet and saying that the British Fleet is in the first battle line of civilization, as it is.

Well, time is drawing to an end. I do want to reiterate what a tremendous part you in Canada can play and are playing, and you will probably play an even greater part, because I think there may be dark days ahead. I know Germany and Italy very intimately. I was in those countries in 1939 and I know we are up against the horrifyingly efficient Nazi machine. Let us not underestimate it. I have never been an easy optimist. I have always

believed that there would be war and that Germany would create such a mechanized force as has never been seen before. It is much better that we realize what we are up against. We didn't, perhaps, in the early weeks of the war. We won't try half measures any longer. There is no use expecting to blow up a tank with an ordinary rifle—you won't. Thank Heavens, there are great concerns on this continent like that represented by my neighbour on the right (General Motors), that are helping us to get the equipment that is necessary and to replace the equipment which was lost at Dunkerque. That was a tragic story. I talked to man after man who lost everything and came back with only the clothes he was wearing. What they minded most of all was the loss of the wonderful equipment left in the sand-dunes and towns of the Low Countries. That was a terrible blow.

People have talked about "missing the bus" in this war. I feel that Hitler missed the bus in the three weeks after Dunkerque. I believe even if the British Expeditionary Force had been captured then, that the war would have been carried on from this continent but we would have been put to it to withstand a Nazi invasion in those anxious days. I don't believe he was hoarding planes up for some future occasion. He wasn't. Hitler was trying to shoot every refugee on the roads that he could get. He was trying to kill every British soldier, undefended as they were against dive bombers. He was trying to terrorize whole populations. All that grim evacuation from the sands of Dunkerque was achieved in those dramatic days when little boats came stealing along, picking up soldiers and going to and fro to the Old Country. That was, I think, when Hitler missed the bus.

Then, that miracle of the knights of the Air! How can one talk adequately about them? Every morning, perhaps five times a day, they return to their aerodromes and fill up with petrol. They don't say that they have done enough for one day when they have been up three times already that day. They want to go on risking their lives, day and night, without end. Has there ever been such

human bravery? Just think what their bravery means to the people in England. I only wish we had double the number of young men.

As Mr. Churchill said, never did so many people owe so much to so few. They believe tremendously in the machines they fly and also in their leadership and that is where Canada is going to play a tremendous part. You cannot imagine how heartening it is to us in the Old Country to know that the wheels of the great machine which you are preparing will soon be under way and by next spring will begin to rotate in an amazing way—the biggest institution ever created in Canada and one of the biggest that ever existed in the British Commonwealth.

Also, what a wonderful thing it is that our best young men come over here to be trained and to mingle with those from New Zealand, Australia and Newfoundland. They will get to know you Canadians in this vast country and forever afterward the British Commonwealth Air Training Plan will no longer be a plan but an actuality. All this will have a great effect in bringing all parts of the British Commonwealth together.

As I told you before, I have known Canada for thirty-four years. I think it was at Esquimalt, British Columbia, in 1906, that I made an inspection of the Canadian Fleet, at that time, as far as I know, consisting of a couple of vessels. I think when war broke out there were fifteen Canadian war vessels in existence. I think perhaps you don't realize sufficiently what has happened since that time. You now have one hundred and fifteen war vessels and a personnel of twelve thousand. And they are such splendid men, many of them born and bred on the prairies. They served their apprenticeship in the depots established across Canada and there they have been learning everything about the sea except seasickness! They will learn that later. They are splendid material, those young seamen, and I understand you will have another hundred vessels in the Canadian Navy in a year's time. I believe that in the future the Canadian Navy will be a force to reckon with, and Canada, with all her sea traditions of the

Maritime Provinces, will once again play a great rôle on the high seas.

So what am I going to say in this last two minutes? I want to say what a privilege it is to talk to an audience like this. You have been very good in listening to me. What is the last thought I would like to leave with you? I think it is this. As you know, just over one hundred years ago, slavery was abolished in the British Empire. At that time, Wilberforce and those who worked with him refused to hearken to those who said that to abolish slavery would be against the natives' interests and couldn't be done. That small group of people under Wilberforce hammered on and finally got rid of the menace of slavery.

To-day, we are really facing, in my view, something much more, or at least, as horrifying, as terrible, as human slavery. We are facing the slavery of the mind. You go to Germany and you will see extraordinary efficiency. I talked to Germans, high and low, last summer. It is an amazing drill and robot civilization, where the individual has no rights at all. He is merely part of a great machine. I wish I had time to talk on that theme. It is an interesting one. All I do want to say is that we are facing a tremendous problem. I have watched Germany closely these last forty years and gradually I have seen Germany stepping downward and downward, human liberty not counting at all there now. A false god has been put up on a pedestal, and young Germany, male and female, worship this false god, brushing aside all the tenets of Christianity. The only thing that counts in Germany to-day is brute force. Don't be under any illusion about it.

After the last war I advocated in print fairer treatment of Germany at Versailles. I also believed and hoped during the first three years of the Nazi régime that Hitler would prove a "good neighbour". I was disillusioned. I saw that a promise meant nothing to him. Nothing means anything to him except domination of the world by the German people, and if any people of this or any other continent think Hitler has any other aim or that you can

buy the tiger off, they are mistaken. You can't. There is no compromise with the spirit of Naziism. It is ruthless, hideous and satanic.

I do say in conclusion, we do not know what other bitter pills we may have to swallow in Africa or elsewhere. We are up against great forces. But there is a growing spiritual force in the Old Country and in the British Commonwealth. We don't think about ourselves only that we may be used to the uttermost to overcome the monster and establish the dictatorship of Christ in this world. (Applause—prolonged.)

DR. H. J. CODY: At the request of the President of the Empire Club, I count it a great honour, in your name, to express from our hearts, our thanks to Sir Evelyn Wrench for the thrilling tale he has told us of the spirit of the old Motherland. It has been a wonderful story—the story of unity, the story of broad, human fellowship, the story of sacrifice, the story of willingness to give tears and blood and life itself for a cause greater than life itself.

Long ago, old Queen Elizabeth, in the threatening days of the Armada, made an address to her troops, in which she said, "I cannot believe that it is the will of God, after all, that England should perish." That is still our profoundest faith, and why? Some of you have read one of the most brilliant of the modern histories of England—George Macaulay Trevelyan's *A History of England*. In the preface to the last revised edition he has used these words. I haven't been able to verify the reference, but substantially these are the words: "In spite of all her mistakes, and all nations make mistakes, the world's best hopes still rest on her." (Applause.)

We are grateful to Sir Evelyn Wrench for coming to give us this splendid tale of endurance and determination. Let us assure him that the true heart of Canada, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, beats with the heart of the Motherland and it is our will and determination that Canada should go to the utmost limit of her power and resources

to stand by the side of the Motherland in this great crisis of human existence.

We are fighting—I am glad he emphasized that as I naturally expected and hoped he would—no ordinary war for balance of power or territory or wealth. It is a struggle for those spiritual values without which human life cannot worthily be lived. It is not merely for democracy as a form of government but for the spiritual values that make democracy worth while.

What is our Christian civilization made up of? The inheritance from Greece of liberty, the inheritance from Rome of law and the Christian inheritance which places infinite value on the individual human soul. Add those together, and you have in the rough and the broad, the civilization for which we are fighting. How could the case be better put than by Sir Evelyn Wrench when he said, "What would happen to the world if Hitler, if Mussolini, if Stalin, if the present regime in Japan dominated the world?" I never forget something that Sir John Willison once said, speaking, I think, at this very table in this very room: "People say what they will about old Britain and the British Empire, what other power in all the world could safely be trusted with the power that she has used and used in the main for freedom and justice and mercy?"

It once was my privilege to be in the British House of Commons when Mr. Phillip Snowden was Chancellor of the Exchequer, and he was making a speech which he closed with words that are familiar now to most of us. They are from Swinburne's famous "Ode to England". They are great words:

All our past acclaims our future: Shakespeare's
voice and Nelson's hand,
Milton's faith and Wordsworth's trust in this our
chosen and chainless land,
Bear us witness; come the world against her,
England yet shall stand.

(Applause.)

"CANADA'S DESTINY"

AN ADDRESS BY

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON,
K.C.

Chairman: The Past President, Dr. F. A. Gaby.

Thursday, October 3, 1940

DR. F. A. GABY: Gentlemen: I feel it is a very great honour to be the Chairman on this occasion and to be associated with such distinguished guests as are here to do honour to our guest-speaker to-day.

Before proceeding with the introduction of the speaker, we have a formality which is necessary at this particular time in order to comply with the regulations set down in the Constitution of the Empire Club. It is necessary that the report of the Nominating Committee be approved in open meeting before the election of the officers of our Empire Club. It was thought that the first official meeting would be a suitable time for this and seemingly appropriate, in view of our guest-speaker to-day. You will recollect at the last meeting of the last fiscal year, all the other officers were elected by the Club and the office of the President was left over for further action. I would like at this moment to ask the Secretary if he will, therefore, read the report of the Nominating Committee, dealing with the Presidency.

MR. H. C. BOURLIER: In the Minutes of the Annual Meeting, held April 25th, 1940, the report of the Nominating Committee reads in part as follows:

"It is recommended the President for the ensuing Club Year be not elected at this meeting, but that the present President carry on for the time being, to which he has agreed. Your Committee asks permission to continue in office until it may be in a position to nominate the President for the year 1940-41."

The Honourable G. Howard Ferguson, K.C. has signified his willingness to accept the position in question, and on behalf of the Nominating Committee, I so beg to report."

THE REVEREND WILLIAM HILLS, Rector, St. Barnabas' Church, seconded the motion.

DR. F. A. GABY: You have heard the resolution, moved and seconded, that Mr. Ferguson act as our President. As a matter of fact, he has been carrying on the duties since sometime in June. What is your wish, Gentlemen?

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Ferguson, it is a great pleasure to officially announce your name as President of the Empire Club for the year 1940-41, and I am sure I am voicing the views of the membership when I say that the Club is to be congratulated on the acceptance of this honour by you. It is only because of Mr. Ferguson's keen sense of responsibility and loyalty to the British Empire that he finally consented to accept our invitation, and he has done this at possible sacrifice to his health and against the wishes of many of his friends who thought the strain might be too great. However, his anxiety to do everything possible to strengthen the war effort by such assistance in the development of a strong public opinion, following on a knowledge of the gravity of the situation, finally influenced Mr. Ferguson to accept and, as he has stated in his own words, identify himself with one of the organizations

founded for the dissemination of the spirit of closer co-operation with the Empire.

We are indeed appreciative of the honour you are conferring upon the Empire Club, Mr. Ferguson, and the effort that you are putting forth in order to serve Canada and the Empire at a time when we need the support of public men to maintain the morale necessary to strengthen our war effort. I do not need to tell this audience of the long public service that Mr. Ferguson has unstintingly given Ontario, Canada and the British Empire. In a forceful manner he has carried out the administration of the various offices he has held. It is over thirty years since he first entered public life as a Member of the Ontario Legislature and during this period he was also honoured with the position of Minister on various occasions. He was Premier of the Province from 1923 to 1930 and Canadian High Commissioner to Great Britain from 1930 to 1935.

We all know that Mr. Ferguson is a keen Imperialist and a true Canadian and he champions all that means closer union of the Empire. We are fortunate to-day in having him to speak on "Canada's Destiny". (Applause.)

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON, K.C.: Dr. Gaby and Gentlemen: I would like to assure you that I not only appreciate the very flattering things that Dr. Gaby said about me but I appreciate much more the honour you do me in asking me to be your President. Dr. Gaby has said, quite correctly, that having arrived at the age where they won't take one into the army, and one can't work in a munitions factory, there is nothing left for one to do but to talk about these things. I felt that perhaps being actively connected with one of the great agencies for the dissemination of public knowledge might enable me to make a small contribution toward the arousing of greater Canadian interest in the development of Canadian citizenship and the closer co-operation of all parts of this great Empire of ours.

I like that word "Empire". (Applause.) Many people criticize the use of it. I have heard people say that it means domination; that it means autocratic control; that it means robbing people of their democratic rights. That is not the view I hold. I think the word "Empire" imports greater things than that. Vastness of outlook, grandeur of stature, dignity of position, influence in the world, a guarantee of protection to all those who come within the orbit of its influence.

Perhaps I should say this: I think many people are confused and misled by the lack of a clear understanding of just what the Statute of Westminster means and how it applies to the Empire. We hear so frequently the use of the term "Commonwealth of Nations" in discussing Imperial relations and Empire affairs that they are regarded by many people as interchangeable, while as a matter of fact the terms mean two very different and distinct things.

I should like to quote exactly the words of the Statute of Westminster, so that you may get more clearly than I can express, just what its meaning is and what its limitations are. The Statute of Westminster, dealing with the Dominions, defines their position as follows: "Great Britain and the Dominions are autonomous communities within the British Empire, equal in status, in no way subordinate one to another in any aspect of their domestic or internal affairs, though united by a common allegiance to the Crown and freely associated as members of the British Commonwealth of Nations."

Now, it must be clear to you that the term "Commonwealth of Nations" applies only to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the four great self-governing Dominions—Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa. But that is a small section of the British Empire, considering either the geographical point of view, its population, the extent of territory, the force of its influence or the ramifications of its people all over the world. The total population of the Commonwealth of Nations is approximately seventy-five million, and they

are spread over about one-tenth of the earth's surface. The population of the British Empire is approximately four hundred million and these occupy one-quarter of the whole world. Surely a vast and important difference!

When people talk about the word "Empire" importing coercion and autocracy, we have only to look about us to be convinced of the fallacy of such views. We have had a complete answer since this war began and it should be convincing to the mind of any person. It is to be found in the widespread, universal, enthusiastic, voluntary assistance that has been contributed in the way of dollars and cents, pounds, shillings and pence, as well as in men and equipment, from the various sections of the Empire; from the little islands in the South Sea; from the West Indies; from India; from Newfoundland and all the colonies and outposts scattered in every part of the world. Wherever the spirit of the British Empire has touched the people; wherever they have been inspired and taught what Empire means, as administered by British people, they have given the most unquestioned evidence of their loyalty to it and their desire to see it perpetuated. (Applause.) That, it seems to me is a complete answer to people who talk about decadent empires and autocratic empires.

We are a self-governing people within the orbit of the British Empire, and I hope, I believe, I am confident, that—even unconsciously—we respond to her leadership, because there is no other aggregation of people since the world began that has given the same, unselfish, inspiring, uplifting leadership to the common people as has the British Empire. (Applause.)

Now what is Canada's destiny to be? That, I think, is what I told the Secretary I would talk about. What is our future to be? "Without vision the people perish." In other words, we must have always a constructive outlook in the course of our conduct and our action, and if we are dealing with the nation's affairs, it must be an outlook that will be of advantage to the nation as a whole and to the individuals who make up the nation.

In the light of our experience, founded upon the

knowledge we have, being guided and influenced by the conduct and example of others, has anyone here the slightest doubt that while we all desire to see Canada expand to the utmost limit, at the same time we want to see her maintain, encourage and inculcate future generations with the basic spiritual impulses that have made the British Empire great.

After all, Gentlemen, material advantages, of course are most valuable in the progress of a people and contribute to their happiness and well-being, but the great impelling force, the force that inspires, the force that consciously or unconsciously gives direction to all thought and action, is a great spiritual force that has more to do with the shaping of events and lives of peoples and nations than any material interest can possibly have.

When I say a spiritual force, I use the word in a broad sense—not only from the religious standpoint, but from the standpoint of better life, greater outlook on life's problems, clearer vision. The man who lives at the top of the hill has a wider horizon and a clearer view of the landscape and its conformation. He has all the brilliance of sunshine, as compared to the man who lives in the valley, in the shadow, in the dampness and the depression. This Empire of ours stands out on a great eminence, visible to all the peoples of the world and carries aloft the torch that was thrown to future generations from falling hands. It is the only nation in the world that has made any attempt to fulfill that obligation which we undertook as a result of the tremendous trial through which we passed from 1914 to 1918. The very fact that Britain carries that torch gives her courage, gives her steadfastness of purpose, aye, gives us all confidence in the ultimate success of our cause. (Applause.)

I remember, in the days when I read the writings of great thinkers, reading the essays of Herbert Spencer. Two of them impressed themselves indelibly upon my mind,—one essay upon *The Influences of Heredity Upon the Future Generations*, and the other, *The Influences of Environment*, and really when one got through reading

those two discussions, it was difficult for one to make up one's mind which was the most influential factor in the shaping of one's course in life.

But fortunately, in the case of the Britisher, we don't have to rely upon one or the other of these factors in the moulding of the British character. The British people have the unique advantage of enjoying both influences. We have inherited a long line of inspiring achievements that have given us a proud background for the shaping of a constructive national course. We have consistently maintained, even in the old crumbling abbeys and the ivy-mantled towers, the impressive solidarity of the buildings, the beauty of the countryside—we have maintained an environment in Britain that couldn't do otherwise than elevate men's minds and teach them affection and loyalty to the country in which they live.

Look on the ancestry of Britain's tradition—Nelson and Drake, Wellington and Roberts. Aye, and on the cultural side, Shakespeare and Milton, Dickens, Scott and Burns—all through the ages there have been filtering into the atmosphere and keeping alive and active, the things that influence men's minds, shape their character and mould their future conduct.

A familiar quotation that constantly comes to my mind and that has a world of truth in it, is Kipling's pregnant words—"And what should they know of England who only England know?"

You can apply that to the whole of the British Isles. Travel from end to end—all its physical beauty, all the ancient monuments, all the towers that mark the mile-posts of her progress and her greatness—we can see all those and yet we don't know England. We can come away filled with admiration, inspired with the sight, impressed with the peaceful atmosphere, and yet we don't know England. To know England you must know the British people. You must have an opportunity to come in contact with them and study their character, because it is character that is counting for us now. Don't make any mistake about that.

Part of my mission in life has been to know everybody I could know, either for good or bad. I think that there is no more valuable educational contact that you can make than with your fellow-man, and during my stay in England I sought to perpetuate the habit because I found (politically anyway) it worked well over here. So I studied the people of every section I could, particularly in that great old City of London which is the shrine of the world's greatness. (Applause.) I have tramped through Limehouse and Sarah Streets, Whitechapel, Shoreditch, Bethal Green and all the rest of the interesting districts down through there. I have talked to the simple workaday people, talked to them about their country, their lives and their outlook, and have endeavoured to ascertain if they have complaints to make and what they think of Great Britain's future. It was heartening to get the assurance from the old flower girls or those Cockneys, those away-down-east-dwellers. They didn't express it so, but what they meant was what has been expressed in that song, "There'll Always Be An England", and day after day, for the past many weeks, night after night, these men and women and children, these simple people have suffered without complaint and with resolute spirit as perhaps no people in the world for a thousand years at any rate, have been called upon to suffer and endure. With what result? There is a challenge to their character and their greatness. They believe in the country. They have confidence in themselves and they are determined that to the last man and the last shot, England, Great Britain, the Empire shall survive and it will survive. (Applause.) That is character—British character, in all its greatness and glory—asserting itself.

I am perhaps not talking much about Canada's destiny, because I can say it in a very few words. The tendency of the world is for co-ordination, the co-operation of larger units of population; greater national organizations, if you like to put it that way. That is the trend of thought. Are we going to be drawn into that flood? Undoubtedly we will. Undoubtedly we will be influenced by it. Unques-

tionably we are facing it now, whether we realize it or not.

It is well for us to have all the defence that it is possible for us to establish to maintain inviolate our own country and protect our own liberties. But stop and think to what extent, in a country as vast as this, with the wealth it has, with its population of ten or eleven million, we can create and maintain defences that will keep off the unscrupulous, marauding brigands that are abroad to-day.

Now, there are two alternatives. One of them is being discussed to-day—closer co-operation with our neighbours to the south. If I may express a personal opinion, I think this common defence arrangement is a good thing—a splendid thing. We have many similar conditions and reciprocal obligations and I think we can work them out better as two contiguous countries working together for that object. But I stop there and I stop for this reason. I believe the future greatness of this country depends upon its retaining the tradition that has made Great Britain great. (Applause.) I believe that there is inspiration to be had from that source that we cannot have from any place else, and with my highest respect and good will and gratitude to our neighbours to the south of us, I believe that our duty, our main duty, is to remain a part, an integral part of the British Empire.

Now, I told you some time ago that I had put my politics in cold storage. I have an awful time keeping the door locked.

You know, there is an old Spanish proverb which runs like this—"At the end of the street called Bye-and-Bye, stands the hostel Never." You can't go on hesitating and procrastinating and postponing. You must be definite in your course and you must be forward in your action. The question as to what direction Canada is to take in the future is something for the Canadian people to decide and something that they must decide in the very near future, if for no other reason, for an outstanding material reason. I believe that Canada is one of the countries that is going to reap tremendous ascendancy and opportunity as a result of this war. In Europe they have had three wars since

1870. They are in the midst of the third one and from all I can learn, from correspondence and from people with whom I have come in contact in Europe, there are tens of thousands of people who are not going to bring up their children to face the prospect of another destruction such as they have had to go through. They are going to seek security and peace and the opportunity for individual advancement in a country where it will be guaranteed to them and where they can enjoy all that is good in life without being subject to the attack of the beasts in human form that are abroad to-day.

There will always be men of that type in the world and if you read the pages of history you will find that periodically their sheer fanaticism draws people about them. Selfishness induces their action—egotism, megalomania, a fanatical craze for power and domination, and they stop at nothing. You see, since the rise of this mental and moral pervert in Germany there is no scruple, no limitation. Who can give us any guarantee that it won't recur with future generations?

That is the way thousands of people in Europe are looking at this problem to-day, and if the few letters I get from people whom I know are at all representative of the general opinion—and I think they are—great numbers of these people, great hosts of them, are going to get out of Europe. Where are they going? Canada is the closest in-contact. Of course our friends to the south will attract a lot of people, but it is out duty now, I think, to begin with some forethought and foresight to prepare a well-thought-out plan, not only of admitting people, because we really haven't any plan now. I don't mean at the present time only, but we never have had. We have to work out some scheme that will bring to this country the proper people and direct the people who come here to proper locations, where opportunities will be available to them and where their surroundings will be congenial.

If we do that, the accretion of wealth and people will give Canada such an opportunity as she has never before experienced and will put her in the forefront, not only of

the nations of the Commonwealth, but will give her ascendancy and an influence in world affairs such as she has never thought of.

After all, influence in world affairs, I think, is one of the great objectives that any people should have. We can all manage our own little household, our own little business, our own community, to suit ourselves but if we have high standards, moral codes and spiritual influence behind us, there is no reason, with the extent of territory, the opportunities, the great variety of wealth in almost fabulous quantities that lie here—there is no reason in the world why the next generation in this country shouldn't find themselves in a position to make a great contribution to Canada's national life. The essential thing Canada must do is continue to take her inspiration from the fountain of all good things that is to be found across the Atlantic Ocean, in the Homeland shrouded in the fog and mists of the North Sea.

I remember when I had to travel in Europe a bit. When I put my foot on British soil again at Dover or Folkestone, or any British port, I got a thrill in my pulse, a different outlook on life, a sense of freedom, liberty, security. What has she done to promote that? I have said something about spiritual influence and what it comes from. One of the most important factors is the sense of security she has created by the just interpretation of her laws and the careful administration of them. Where will you go in the world that people don't point to and comment upon the interpretation that is put upon life's conduct as portrayed by our Parliament, our representative institutions?

I believe that one important factor is the solemnity, the earnestness, the sincerity with which they carry out their public duties. I don't know how many of you have ever seen the opening of the Courts in London. It is one of the most impressive sights I have ever seen in my life. All the Judges are assembled in the House of Lords under the Lord Chancellor, and from there they march in orderly and dignified procession to the old Abbey where a solemn service is held, asking Divine guidance and blessing upon

their deliberations and judgments and that they may be guided in their wisdom in the best interests of all the people of the Empire. They proceed to this service in their long black gowns and their ermines and full bottom wigs. At the head of the procession is the Bible, then the Mace and the scales of Justice. After this service they go back to the House of Lords and from there disperse to the various courts. This ceremony is an integral part of their judicial administration. If you were to see the thousands of people who crowd about old Parliament Square and other places of vantage to see that procession, to see how earnestly and seriously these men take their duties, the men to whom their future security and well-being is entrusted. The mere fact that this ceremony is carried out year after year and is witnessed by huge crowds made up of all classes is surely convincing evidence of its importance to the people and its influence upon the national life. The judgments of the British courts are quoted in every country in the world and shape the life of all civilized peoples everywhere.

This same high standard of the interpretation and administration of law and order is part of our inheritance. We have inherited our parliamentary institutions, our judicial organizations. We started to follow Britain with our Civil Service but we have slipped badly in this important matter. Over there they provide a career for you. In this country they only go so far as to provide a job and a mighty uncertain one, but we will get there after a bit. The tendency is to provide a career for men who go into the Service with the earnest desire to make their contribution in whatever field they may choose toward the improvement of the country.

Why is it that for all the years that we have been carrying on our affairs and our methods of life modelled after principles of the Mother Country we have not been interfered with? Why haven't we been invaded? For the very same reason that the President of the United States gave the other day for their never having been invaded. The British Navy stands between them and interference.

The British Navy for centuries has stood between us and danger. Since the founding of this country it has stood between us and the man who would be tempted to invade us.

Mr. Chairman, I am afraid this has been a bit of a rambling talk, but I wanted to bring home to you what, in my view, should be the course followed by this country, what should be the outlook of all our public men in this country and what should be the urge of all Canadian citizens. Hold fast to the things that are good. Remember the advantages we have had. Don't forsake your spiritual fathers. Never let your children forget the traditions upon which Britain's greatness is founded. (Applause—prolonged.)

DR. F. A. GABY: Those in this room have indeed been fortunate to have had the opportunity of listening to this excellent address to-day. It has been a loss to our radio hearers because of the regulations that have been adopted that a manuscript must be submitted forty-eight hours previous to each broadcast on the radio. Unfortunately, under stress of time, and probably disability, Mr. Ferguson was unable to prepare the manuscript in time. Therefore, this address has not been broadcast to-day.

Before extending our thanks and appreciation to our President, I would say we have with us the "Grand Old Man" of Ontario, Sir William Mulock, and he has consented to extend, on our behalf, our thanks and appreciation for the address of to-day. (Applause.)

SIR WILLIAM MULOCK: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Ferguson, Dr. Cody and Gentlemen: I will not spoil the able address of Mr. Ferguson by attempting in any way to review it or comment on it in detail. It was thoughtful, it was inspiring, it was encouraging. It was a masterful address, representing, I believe, the hearts and views of everybody in this assembly and practically of all Canadians in dealing with the subject, "Canada's Destiny". I apprehend no doubts whatever on that subject. I received

this morning two letters from two soldiers of Toronto who have gone abroad. They each, although writing from different parts of England, referred to beautiful England and the flowers of England. I was reminded of those letters when Mr. Ferguson referred to beautiful England. He spoke of the inspiration of the environment. There England, like a jewel, rests upon the unadorned bosom of the ocean. That is England to-day and as England will no doubt be in the future.

Mr. Ferguson referred to the Westminster Act as a bond of union between all parts of this Empire. The union holding together all parts of this Empire depends upon no legislation. There is one bond of union, enough for us all, a union the strength of a silken cord, mightier than that of the heavier rope—the love of Great Britain and all old England stands for. (Applause.) I care not whether you call it an Empire, a Commonwealth of Nations, or whatever you may call it, it means a united British Empire.

As to the title of Mr. Ferguson's address—"The Destiny of Canada"—has anyone any doubts, whether Great Britain survives or not, that we will be with her in all her troubles, in all her successes, to the end of time? (Applause.) Whatever may be the future of the old Empire, there will Canada be. I shall repeat to you some words that I think fairly represent Canada in its relation to the Empire. They are the answer of Ruth to her mother, Naomi, when Ruth was being urged to live apart from her mother: "Where thou goest, I will go, where thou lodgest, I will lodge. Thy people shall be my people; thy God shall be my God, and where thou diest I will die, and there will I be buried." (Applause.)

Those words, in my opinion, represent Canada's future in relation to the Empire.

On your behalf I will convey to our speaker of to-day our grateful thanks for his instructive and inspiring and patriotic address. (Applause.)

DR. F. A. GABY: Thank you, Sir William, for the very admirable way in which you extended the vote of thanks of the Empire Club.

The members of the Empire Club will be pleased to learn that Lieutenant Commander H. F. Pullen, newly appointed to command one of the United States destroyers transferred to the Royal Navy, and by it transferred to the Canadian Navy, now the H.M.C.S. "St. Francis", is a son of Mr. Frank Pullen, member of our Executive Committee. Also Lieutenant Commander Morson A. Medland, who was appointed to H.M.C.S. "St. Croix", is a nephew of Mr. Gordon Medland, also a member of the Empire Club. We are all gratified for the service being rendered by these young men.

"A BATTALION COMMANDER'S EXPERIENCE IN THE FIRST YEAR OF THE WAR"

AN ADDRESS BY

BRIGADIER ERIC W. HALDENBY, M.C., V.D.

Chairman: The President, The Honourable G. Howard Ferguson.

Thursday, October 10, 1940

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON: Gentlemen: I expect I shall have the privilege of introducing many important people to this Club during my term of office, but I can assure you that on no occasion will I have greater pleasure than I feel to-day in presenting to you our good friend Brigadier Haldenby (applause), affectionately and familiarly known to all of us as Eric Haldenby. Gentlemen, I present Eric Haldenby. (Loud applause.)

BRIGADIER ERIC W. HALDENBY, M.C., V.D.: Mr. President, Sir William Mulock and Members of the Empire Club: I thank you from the bottom of my heart for the very kind reception you have given my name to-day. I cannot tell you how very thrilling it is to be back home in Toronto and to see so many of my old friends. This seems to be a wonderful opportunity to speak to so many of my friends that I could not otherwise get in touch with. As I look around the room to-day it does thrill me with a great deal of pride to think that so many of you are willing to come out and hear whatever inadequate address I can give. I would ask you to bear with me if I

seem to stick to my notes very closely, because, as this has to deal with service in the war zone, I have to submit everything I am to say to the censors, and of necessity I must stick closely to my notes.

I am going to try and give you a very simple account of the first year of the war as experienced by a battalion commander in the First Canadian Division.

The story of the raising of the unit and its subsequent training and move overseas is the usual experience of any battalion going on active service, and there is no use dwelling on that further.

We arrived in port on New Year's Eve and had a long cold journey in the train riding through bleak snow-covered fields. Now, if you recall, Christmas last December in Canada was mild, with no snow, and for Canadians to leave Canada, without wearing great coats and to arrive in England to find the temperature very low and the weather extremely bad, was quite a surprise.

For the first time in its history the Regiment was stationed at Aldershot and were given the fine old Corrunna Barracks, the home of so many great regiments in the past and recently rehabilitated by the building of splendid messing quarters and baths. We were proud to be stationed in this, the greatest military settlement in the world, especially as two battalions of our allied Regiment, the Gordon Highlanders, were in adjoining barracks. The fact that the buildings were desperately cold and that most of the plumbing was frozen detracted only a little from our pride in all the excitement of the famous place. The men felt that they were at least in England and were getting closer to active service. We were told, much to our amusement, the old superstition that a soldier having once been stationed at Aldershot always comes back to the place. We remembered it later.

There was one thing that amazed us all. There were the most elaborate precautions for air-raids. Bomb-proof shelters were to be found everywhere, fire fighting apparatus was standing ready in our own lines, great tanks of water were built between the buildings and the most

elaborate preparations were made for the decontamination of clothing and the body after gas attacks. We thought it all very elaborate and unnecessary but were to bless this forethought and carefulness later on.

Our first big experience was to be asked to take part in a review of the Gordon Highlanders in Aldershot by the Colonel of the Gordons, Sir James Burnett. The Canadians did extremely well and received profuse praise from the Gordons, which was very gratifying, as we were naturally a little nervous about this, being up against an old Imperial Regiment. That night the officers of the 48th gave a dinner for the officers of the Gordons and it was a most glorious celebration. Here we were at last working with our mother Regiment and receiving their commendation, which pleased us greatly.

Intensive individual training started immediately, despite the foul weather. We fired our practices on the ranges even when the fire trenches and butts had to be cleared of snow to do so. It was considered essential that we get right on with our training.

General McNaughton held a conference of all the Commanding Officers in his Division and he pointed out very clearly and very precisely that every man must be thoroughly trained to be an efficient soldier and that the desire of himself and of his staff was to help the officers as much as possible in this work, and not to find fault; the idea was to give all the assistance they could, but it was also quite clear that every Commanding Officer would be held strictly responsible for the results. The First Canadian Division must be ready for action to the last man.

The training proceeded without interruption. Every man, no matter what his job might be, was instructed and tested. He learned the use of his rifle, the Bren gun, anti-aircraft mounting, the anti-tank rifle, the 2-inch and 3-inch mortar and the hand grenade. He was shown how to protect himself against gas, against an attack and by the use of camouflage. He was toughened by trench digging, physical training and long marches. He was taught to find his way to work at night. It was most essential

that the troops should be thoroughly familiar with night work because, as is obvious of course, most of the movements are done by night now, with aircraft so active. Every man was taught some special work so that he would be a reserve for special work, such as the mechanical transport, the signallers or carriers, and that sort of thing. This went on for some time. Then the day of reckoning arrived and the most painstaking and meticulous examination was made of every phase of our training. Our proficiency in drill, arms, personal protection, was investigated, and then our quarters, equipment, accounts, records, files, rations, messing, medical arrangements, recreation facilities, were all gone into, and toward the end of the day the Divisional Commander himself went out to the ranges and lay beside the men and watched them fire. By this time I felt like a wet rag—everything seemed to go wrong, as it always does. You really cannot imagine the very searching examination they make. Of course we were all very concerned, but to our great satisfaction, he said at the end of the day, "Haldenby, your battalion is all right", and walked off. We all heaved a sigh of relief.

From then we went on with collective training which is more interesting. I won't tire you with the stories of trench defence schemes, march schemes and attack schemes. It is sufficient to say that we made ourselves fit to do whatever was required of us in the struggle which we knew was coming in France and Belgium. At that time the training was obviously for a German invasion of Belgium, and of course we were to be prepared to jump in and take up position.

We were on our way to a big training scheme at Salisbury Plain when the Germans invaded Holland. We went on with our training at Salisbury and of course Salisbury, to a good many Canadians, was an old sore point, because we had had such terrible experiences and hardships there in the last war. It soon became apparent that it might be necessary to defend England and we came back to Aldershot and stood by in readiness. The enemy was making great inroads into the Low Countries and it was obvious

that he was not going to slow up until he got a crack at Great Britain.

They decided that the best place to put us was up toward the east centre of England, and the whole Division moved up one night where we were put in a position of readiness to drive out the enemy if he made any attempt at invasion by sea or air. At this time the country suddenly seemed to spring into a warlike appearance and I have never seen such a change in all my life. Road signs completely disappeared, much to the chagrin of young officers still a bit hazy on their map reading. Road blocks appeared everywhere and steel rails, tree trunks and concrete pipe were all brought into use. The people went at it with great zeal and determination. Every large field, golf course or common was blocked with steel, concrete poles or old decrepit motor cars. We reconnoitred all possible places of landing from the sea and I spent a great deal of time going up and down the coast on the twenty-five mile front assigned to me.

Suddenly, to our great joy, we were warned that we were to go to France. Britain was going to back France to the limit in France's death struggle against the mechanized hordes sweeping across Europe. We returned to Aldershot and made final preparations. We were on our way at last. Their Majesties, the King and Queen, came down to Aldershot and saw the Brigade and had tea in the 48th Officers' Mess. They were both charming to everyone and we were proud to think that we were going over to defend Great Britain and to serve them. They walked through the cheering lines of men and shook hands with the old soldiers. It was most informal. It must have been a great task for them as they had to walk for three or four hours, but nothing seemed too much for them to do.

Next day we had our last church parade. It was Sunday and we went to St. Andrew's Church in Aldershot. We then had two days of waiting and we did some stiff marching with full equipment to keep us fit for the hard days to come.

The Germans had broken the Somme defences by this

time and were even thrusting across the Seine. On the 13th of June we left Aldershot and moved to a southern port. We embarked at once to music from the Royal Marine Band, which played us off as we left this port and sailed for France. The men were in great spirits although the news was a bit disturbing. But we were going over and the situation would be cleaned up very rapidly—there was no doubt about that.

We landed at Brest in the morning and the Regiment once more marched on French pavement. It seemed like old times again and everybody felt fine. In good order we slowly made our way up the steep road to the ramparts where the troops could rest and take cover because Brest, being a port, was subject to air-raids. After some tea and food our Brigade Headquarters and the 48th moved down to the railway yards and were put into a very comfortable train. It was rather amazing, especially if you remember the old box cars and that sort of thing. These were two magnificent steel cars for the officers, just turned out of the shops and beautifully equipped. I can still see the lovely pearl grey upholstery and the antimacassars on the chairs.

Our destination was a secret, but knowing French trains in war time all the troops were allowed to send parties to buy bread and butter, and jam and eggs, and beer and wine. We were supposed to be on the train only a few hours but I knew that a few days would be more likely on a French train. We moved off about noon and as the Officer Commanding I opened the secret orders. Our destination was a little town about one hundred and forty miles up the line. That was quite unexpected and on consultation with my Brigadier, Armand Smith, decided that it was apparently a new development. We travelled all day through cheering French civilians and the men enjoyed every minute. They thought it was grand. All the French girls held their thumbs up, signifying we were going to win, and everything was fine.

Here at least we were getting near the scene of action. There were thousands of refugees and everywhere along

the line, which went right through Paris, we saw great stacks of bicycles at each station. There would be a hundred and two hundred bicycles piled in a station. A great many trains passed us, going in the opposite direction, laden with tired and worn out civilian men, women and children. Their appearance was certainly not very bright but the troops felt that was part of the show and they cheered them, too.

At about eleven at night we reached a place called Laval and got further orders to move on to Sable. We moved along all through the night and I began to think we were going to go right through the Maginot Line. The engineer assured me every time he saw me, and eventually at three o'clock we came to our destination and pulled into a great train yard. There wasn't a sound. The yard was filled with cars, full of all sorts of war materials, and it looked to me as if this were some sort of a railway junction to be used as a place for supplies.

We were ready to detrain and in compliance with orders from Brigadier Armand Smith had prepared an all round defence scheme for the village. We didn't know where the enemy was exactly, but we would surround the town with a ring of defence. Fortunately our Brigade Intelligence Officer had had the foresight to bring an excellent set of French road maps which were a great help. Enlargements were made and we divided the whole frontage surrounding the town among the companies. When the train stopped there were faint glimmers of the dawn and we felt it was of vital importance to get the troops in their positions before the light became too bright, in case the enemy reconaissance parties were out.

Suddenly we saw a flash-light coming along the track. Soon an officer appeared and asked for the Officer Commanding on the train. He informed me that he had orders for us from the Quartermaster-General commanding Lines of Communication to move back to Brest at once. You cannot conceive of anything more unexpected and disheartening. These orders seemed so incredible that I saw the Brigadier at once and we questioned this Railway

Transport Officer to ensure that he was not a fifth columnist. We decided that this couldn't be a person of any authority and we had better investigate. We questioned and questioned and the more we questioned the more we became convinced that he was all right. He could give no reason for the extraordinary order, other than that there were rumours of a French capitulation. He was certainly a British Railway Transport Officer, and stated that the other units in the Brigade had been turned back late the night before and that we unfortunately had missed getting the message, although motor cyclists had been sent out to intercept the train at railway crossings. If this were the case we were many miles beyond our nearest unit.

The men, of course, were anxious to stay and put up a fight but it was out of the question. They said, "Let us stay anyway." I said, "All right. You have fifty rounds of ammunition for each man, and two days rations, what do we do when that is over." They said that they would get through some way, that something would turn up. It was obvious nothing would turn up. Our transport was miles away, returning to Brest.

The Railway Transport Officer then left, stating he was going to make a dash for the coast in a motor which he had. He was very uncertain as to the whereabouts of the enemy but thought they were about forty miles north of us. Forty miles is no great distance for an armoured unit, so it was obvious that something very drastic had to be done in the way of action at once. Then a German reconnaissance plane appeared overhead, flying slowly back and forth. We put the men back in the train to keep them out of sight and we began to feel that the situation was rather critical. Brigadier Smith and I decided to move back to Laval, the next station, and get some proper confirmation of the order from the British officers there. Obviously, there was something wrong.

However, we reckoned without our friend, the locomotive engineer. He rebelled when we suggested turning around and going back. He shook his head, there was nothing doing. "*La guerre est fini*", he said. With that

Bill Darling retorted, "Not for us, you miserable skunk", or words to that effect. The engineer had endless excuses. He had not eaten for eighteen hours. All right, we would let him have something to eat. He had no orders from the *Chef de Gare*. All right, we found the station master who confirmed our order to move out. Then he couldn't get up steam. So we got two firemen and fired his boiler for him. He still demurred so we decided to take action. We brought up Sergeant Major Lawrie, who is a locomotive engineer, and he looked over the boiler and said it was all right. We uncoupled the engine, and by the dint of Captain Darling's revolver poking the engineer's ribs and a little red wine, he helped to move the locomotive to the other end of the train. Then we started a long dreary haul up hill, thirty miles to Laval. It was difficult to keep steam up without blowing off the safety valve and yet unless there was a full head of steam the old tin pot wouldn't pull up the hill. The water was running low and the scratch crew were anxious not to blow the boiler to bits. The French engineer was so excited over this affront to his beautiful engine that he acted like a crazy man. We managed to make a little headway but after about two hours I realized we hadn't moved more than a couple of miles over the worst part of the hill and I decided we had better make some protective arrangements in case the enemy had cut us off. We decided to put the train in a state of defence. Captain Ken. Whyte sat out on the cow catcher with a Tommy gun. Major Bill Hendrie, of Hamilton, and Captain Darling were in the cab to keep an eye on the crew and watch for trouble. The windows were broken to eliminate any danger from glass splinters. Holes were punched in the roof to give good anti-aircraft fire and two flat-cars were attached to the train to carry our anti-aircraft guns.

On Brigadier Smith's instructions I held a conference of officers and ordered them to stay with their companies and in case we were held up they were to get out of the train, take cover wherever it offered and open up protective fire. We examined our location and found that

our nearest port was St. Nazaire, seventy miles away, and we thought we should be able to reach it in three night marches. We moved by night and kept out of sight in the daytime because if the enemy were overrunning the country we would be very vulnerable. Every man was to cut down his load to a minimum. He was to hang on to his ammunition at all costs and carry enough rations to keep him going. Spare clothing and equipment were to go by the boards. Every officer must hang on to his compass and his glasses, and, of course, his map. We worked out the route by which we would move out on land and made arrangements that we would meet at the end of the night, before dawn, at certain places on the way, and check up to see that we were all still on the way.

Well, we moved slowly along, still having trouble to keep up steam and still expecting to come under bursts of machine-gun fire at any moment. Nothing happened and eventually the whole train pulled into Laval station, and with a great deal of trepidation I saw the Railway Transport Officer at once and asked about all this. He at once confirmed our previous orders; we were to go back to Brest as fast as we could. He said the French had taken a terrific hammering in the last few days and the civilian population, of course, had been given a terrifically bad time by bombers. The fifth columnists were active and the whole country was in a rather chaotic condition. He said that they were asking for an armistice, and of course it is difficult to say now what the true story of the whole French disaster was. They put up a heroic resistance, but nobody knows exactly what happened and I suppose it will only be known after the war. However, this was not our business. We had to get clear or we would spend the rest of the war in a barbed wire cage.

We obtained a new locomotive and with the same engine crew we started down the line. We reached Rennes about one o'clock and found things very upset. This great railway junction for the whole of northwest France had been heavily bombed. The railway officials kept us sitting in the train in the yards for two hours. Eventually we got

under way and to our amazement we found we were going north, and Brest was due west. We have never known why this was done. Either the road had been closed at Brest or a mistake was made. At the first stop we saw Bill Hendrie, who was commanding the cab, and ordered him to make for St. Malo, which we reached at approximately five o'clock. We found that there was apparently no boat available for three days. We saw the Embarkation Staff Officer and he promised to do what he could and a Brigade Staff Officer persuaded him to crowd us on to a channel steamer that was built to hold seven hundred and already had fifteen hundred troops from all branches of the British Army on it. We thought another seven hundred wouldn't make much difference. We tucked the men into little corners of the ship and got them all on. We left the harbour at high tide and despite the ominous warnings that we would be bombed, we got away without trouble. Providence was generous. We had a smooth crossing and returned to England at a different port from which we had sailed. We felt very much chagrined at the great reception which we were given by the English populace. We had been three days in France and never a shot was fired. To the veterans who had fought in the last war it was very embarrassing. However, we learned later that we had been much closer to the enemy than we imagined. It seemed that the enemy had crossed our line behind us, but never dreaming that any troops were ahead of him, had neglected to blow up the track or block it.

Once more we returned to Aldershot. It was a sad collection of men that moved back into our old Corrunna Barracks. We settled down to hard training. I held a parade of the Regiment and explained to them the reasons for our withdrawal and the necessity for us to be ready for the coming invasion. It was obvious that when they cleaned up on France they would turn toward England. The British Army was rearming after the Dunkerque miracle, and the First Canadian Division, with certain other British Divisions, was to be ready to drive the enemy into the sea should he attempt a landing. All the country-

side in our area was reconnoitred and every conceivable situation which might arise was studied. We had practice moves by day and night. Everyone was keen for something to start.

The troops were moved away from Aldershot down to a position of readiness, under cover of a great forest. Slit trenches were dug so that the men could take shelter at a moment's notice. Our position was hidden away in woods, in a great park on a large estate. We explained to the troops that the owner of the estate took a poor view of the shooting of any deer in the park and that the ducks on the ornamental lake were not intended for the edification of the Canadian soldiers. They were very good about this, but I noticed that the ducks slowly but surely disappeared. The deer seemed to have a better time.

I would like to say at this time that the attitude of the English civilian population was always of the most kindly and appreciative nature. They seemed to feel that we were there to defend them and that nothing they could do to help us was too much trouble. I shall never forget the very sincere evidence of gratitude shown by so many land-owners and their very obvious desire not to make any complaints at any petty damage done by the troops. One day I was out on a scheme and was pleased to find we were defending Plaw Hatch, the home of Sir Robert Kindersley. After the exercise was over we called on Sir Robert who was amused to find that Canadians were defending his house and was most hospitable.

When the bombing started in July the troops were ready for it. I think it was rather a relief for everyone. Here at last was something active. The civilian population behaved magnificently and all the elaborate air-raid precautions which had been standing idle for months swung into action. The air-raid wardens, both men and women, were splendid. They would don their steel hats and respirators and set forth in the midst of the bombing with all the courage of old veterans. I have the greatest respect for them. And that amazing organization, the Local Defence Volunteers, who perform their civilian work by day

and stay up night after night, also deserve unstinted praise. They stop everything on the roads at night, and even in the fields and commons. Woe betide the person who cannot produce his identity card. Also, never trifle with them when they shove their rifle at you and call "Halt!" They don't fool and their finger is on the trigger.

The battalion carried on its training of marching, weapon training and tactical exercises steadily through August and September. The presence of enemy planes bombing during an attack scheme adds considerable interest to the proceedings. I remember receiving a message that a certain crossroads had been blown up and the message neglected to state that it was only a training message. We took action immediately and despatched engineers only to find that it was a practice.

Another interesting thing happened when the 48th were firing machine-gun practices at a well known rifle range. An enemy plane came over at about five hundred feet. The anti-aircraft machine-gun which is always mounted near troops while training, opened fire and to our amazement, brought it down. The German was a very young boy of about seventeen. He was hit on the arm and the leg and decided he could never make the channel crossing. General McNaughton was very pleased as it was the first plane brought down by Canadians, and he issued a special order of the day.

The danger of parachutists and troop-carrying planes is constant, and elaborate arrangements are made for cleaning them up. I cannot give you the details of this scheme but it is sufficient to say that troops can be on the ground anywhere in a remarkably short time. One day in August we received the signal at our Headquarters and rushed troops to the spot indicated at once. The troops combed the area and swept up a heterogeneous collection of individuals inhabiting rural England. There was a postman, a market gardener, some farm labourers and various odds and ends, all herded together and very much alarmed. It is impossible to take anyone for granted because we know that the Hun uses all manner of disguises.

However, they were all examined and all seemed to have their cards and to be fairly respectable people. A Staff Officer appeared and ordered their release. Apparently some person had seen a number of anti-aircraft shells burst and mistaking them for parachutes reported a large-scale landing. You have to be continually on the alert for parachute landers.

Nothing can be said too greatly in praise of our Navy and Air Force. They are magnificent and they are doing a great job now. There is no question that the Army had their show in France and are just on guard now, but these two services are simply magnificent. I have watched many of the great raids, and the spectacle of our fighter command squadrons mounting to battle long before the enemy arrives is inspiring. We know the enemy raid is coming, the sirens start going, and soon we see the little silver dots in the sky, anywhere from fifty to a hundred, at great height, and the fighter squadrons come up and charge through them. Our planes dive into them and break up their formations and soon you see planes come shrieking down, followed by the parachutes slowly swinging to earth. The German pilots are taken prisoners and seem to be quite contented with it all. They apparently know they will be decently treated and they no longer expect to be attacked, as they did at first. Some friends of mine saw a German land on the ridge of a roof. He sat on the ridge and pulled out a comb to comb his hair. I suppose he thought he was going to get a public reception.

I have mentioned the calmness and determination of the civilian population. The people are simply wonderful. They do not complain. They realize that they are in the front line of the British defences and it is amazing the way they sprang into action when the air attack on England started. There is no panic or alarm. If damage is done it is cleared away without any fuss. Business goes on as usual, and it is the worst possible form to show any concern over the enemy's attempt to break the spirit of the man in the street. It is just ignored, and if the enemy thinks he is breaking the spirit of the British people he

is making a terrible mistake. They tell me there is enough glass in England to replace every window twice. I can easily believe it. You may see a long row of houses with the windows blown in during the night, the next day they are replaced, and that is all there is to it. They seem to have everything ready and they are not going to have London destroyed. I have no hesitation in saying that Germany will never succeed in breaking the spirit of the British people, no matter what happens.

Lastly, I would like to speak of the splendid *esprit de corps* in our own troops. They are anxious to fight, they are ready, they are fit, and they are looking forward very keenly to something happening. When it does, they are certainly going to make their mark.

I would like also to mention our great auxiliary services, the Salvation Army and the Young Men's Christian Association, and the work they have done for the recreation of the men. I don't know that it is any greater than in the last war but it seems better organized, it seems more complete, and they all seem to be on the job. They are always there to give the men tea on cold nights and to have cigarettes ready.

The Red Cross is doing a splendid job in supplying comforts for the men and I cannot say too much in appreciation of these organizations. Another splendid thing the troops now have is the old County Council Hall that has been taken over and is the Beaver Club in London. It is really a beautiful place, a most comfortable and liveable place. The High Commissioner in London organized the place and the people supplied the funds. It has been a splendid thing in every way.

One more word as to the Canadian Corps. The leadership and organization is as nearly perfect as anything can ever be. The Corps Commander, General McNaughton, has worked endlessly to build up a great fighting force and as one of his junior officers it ill behoves me to say any word of praise of this great Commander. I just cannot help saying that every officer and everyone in the ranks of the Corps worship him and trust him implicitly. He is

the grandest man. Also I would like to pay a final tribute to the men in my own Regiment who gave me magnificent support and who were most loyal and most efficient all through the period of my Command. (Loud cheers.)

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON: Bishop Renison has been good enough to agree to say a word of appreciation on behalf of all of us.

BISHOP RENISON: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: I am quite sure that we have listened to-day to a story that thrills every Canadian to the marrow of his bones. (Applause.) When Brigadier Haldenby came home there were thousands of people in the city of Toronto, to say nothing of the rest of the country, who wanted just to look at him and to have the opportunity of shaking his hand, not only for his own personal qualities, of which I would presume to say nothing, but because he is the incarnation, in the minds of the people of Toronto, of the Canadian citizen soldier at his very best. (Applause.) It is a long time since St. Julian and the second Battle of Ypres, and we remember very well that the great meaning of that story, tragic at it was, was the fact that it revealed that no professional soldiers in the world, however efficient they might be, with the limitations of their culture and their idealism, in the long run could stand up before the concentrated and inspired resolution of free peoples. (Applause.) And that little story—of which I am sure Brigadier Haldenby has heard too much, from his own point of view—that saga, that little epic of the lost soldiers who went into the dark like men on a camping trip, who knew exactly what to do and how to do it, may be, as the Brigadier says himself, a comparatively small thing but it isn't a small thing to the people of Toronto. It isn't a small thing to the people of Canada. It isn't a small thing to the civilized world, because it shows us a picture of what is going to happen on the larger scale when the decision of the future of the world has to be made. (Applause.)

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON: Thank you so much, Bishop Renison. There are just one or two things I would like to mention before we break up. We have with us to-day one who has seen the war at very close range and who, I hope, will be able to come and talk to us some day—Mr. Matthew Halton, of the *Toronto Star*. I regret very much that Mr. Piper who travelled far and abroad and made a study of conditions in many countries during war time is too ill to be present. I hope that the time will come when we will have the privilege of hearing from these gentlemen a close-up view of exactly what the conditions are.

“YESTERDAY AND TO-DAY IN AMERICA”

AN ADDRESS BY

VICTOR GOGGIN.

Chairman: The President, The Honourable G. Howard
Ferguson.

Thursday, October 19, 1940

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON: Gentlemen: I have the very unique pleasure of presenting to you to-day Mr. Victor Goggin. Perhaps the fact that he has been residing for a great number of years in New York has given us all the impression he is an American citizen. You may have observed that we did not drink the health of the President. The reason is that Mr. Goggin has never given up his Canadian citizenship, and I think he is, and I know we are all, very proud of that fact. As a matter of fact, I don't know how he very well could, because I remember his father very well, who was a great Canadian and a British patriot. Many of you in this room will remember Dr. P. J. Goggin who was one of the early Presidents of this Club. He served it a number of years very actively and did a great deal to promote the very spirit we are trying to revive at the present time across Canada. I had the great privilege of knowing Dr. Goggin—of knowing him very well personally—because he became the Editor of our text-books and when I was Minister of Education I was perhaps more pleased to take suggestions and directions from him than from most of the officials around the Department, because he had a delightfully persuasive, pleasant, earnest way of doing things and one

always felt sure his motives were sincere and public spirited.

To-day we have his distinguished son with us. I thought it would be a very nice thing if we had some Canadian who lives away from home in the atmosphere of our American neighbours, to come here and tell us exactly what the situation is down there, why it has been so, and what it is to-day. It would be of very great interest and should clarify the views of a great many people in this country toward their neighbours.

I have the greatest pleasure in the world in presenting to you my good friend, Mr. Victor Goggin. (Applause.)

MR. VICTOR GOGGIN: Mr. President and Gentlemen: I thank you, Sir, for your kindly remarks, and you, gentlemen, for this most generous reception.

I take your applause as a tribute to the name I bear. I take it is a tribute to my father, rather than a recognition on your part of anything that I may have done.

The Empire Club was part of home to my father. His many friends in the Empire Club were part of the best in life to him. The accomplishments of the Empire Club were his pride and served as part recompense for a long life devoted almost entirely to public service.

I consider it a privilege to be here to-day to speak to you because it gives me an opportunity to do what my father would like to have done but, by reason of his nature, could never have done. That is to express publicly his thankfulness for your friendship and his appreciation and admiration of you all.

When your worthy President, in that artful way of his, asked me to come and address you to-day, I was at a loss for a subject. I knew that the Empire Club had heard a multitude of fine speakers on a multitude of subjects and there couldn't be much that was new or worth while left for you to hear. While I was mulling the matter over, it seemed to me that perhaps it would be fitting if I attempted to answer some of the questions about United States public affairs that Canadians ask me when they come to

New York. While thinking of this, I happened to have a session with a group of our workers at The Maple Leaf Fund, and there I had to answer a host of questions as to why certain Canadians has said this and that about certain things American.

When thinking this over, it came to me that if to-day I could trace for you certain happenings and show their influence on public opinion in the United States, I would possibly furnish you with an understanding of the reasons for certain phases of American public opinion that seem unnatural to Canadians. All I propose to do is to tell you to-day a little of what will later be written in the history books about yesterday, in the hope that the recital may bring you the answers to many of the things that have seemed difficult to understand.

What I say is for myself alone, and when I use the term, "we", I speak as a resident of the United States, voicing what I believe to be a cross-section of the opinion of the man on the street.

There must be a beginning, so let us go back about a quarter of a century and follow history awhile. In 1914, with you of the Empire, we saw the lights go out over Europe. We were present and one with you, when they were relit on Armistice Day. Like you, we then hoped for Peace. We looked forward to the high promise of the new day, to the end of insecurity, insincerity, want and those things that make for war. The same as you, we did not take the warnings plain there for everyone to see. With you, we let Might take place of Right. With you, we let lies, deceit, insincerity become more commonplace than Truth. And like you, we did not say a word.

Equally with you, however, we shared a basic insecurity consequent upon all these things. Whether we spoke of it or not, we were haunted by a fear of impermanence in all our relations. We wanted a country, a home, something real, secure, dependable, in a slippery, shadowy and nervous world.

We watched and followed the Empire after the War. How we admired it as we saw it lift itself out of the mire

by its own shoe strings. We have compared it with ourselves, and particularly since 1929, the way the Empire took hold and carried on, has made us proud we have a common tongue.

And that is the way we felt, and the way we felt about the Empire, as we in the United States came to 1938, the start of the White War—the war of nerves.

To understand and follow the course of any events involving human factors, we must have a knowledge of the capacity and interrelation of those factors. So let us start by looking at the composition of the population of the United States.

The United States is a country of large minorities, despite the fact that its language, literature and institutions stem from Britain. Out of a population of some one hundred and thirty-one millions, over one-third of the total population is foreign born, or the children of foreign or mixed parentage. The largest minorities in the country are from the Totalitarian countries.

Let us run down the list: Of Germans, there are six million eight hundred thousand; Italians, four million five hundred thousand; British, four million three hundred thousand; Irish, three million, one hundred thousand; of seventy-nine other nations, there are seventeen million eighty thousand; and of Negroes, twelve million.

There are more than half as many Germans in the United States as there are people in Canada. There are more than a third as many Italians as there are people in Canada. The total Germans and Italians in the United States approximates the total population of Canada.

Now, it is a known fact in any country that a well-organized and vocal minority pulls a great many times its own weight in affairs of public moment, and that minorities oftentimes consolidate and by furnishing a balance of power, make governments representative of blocs, not majorities. Such governments are not free governments.

And in election years, minority group influence increases. Have you any doubt in this election year in the United States, an election year that comes in a world

crisis, an election year that finds the motherlands of the three largest groups in this country locked in a life-and-death struggle, an election year that finds the two largest groups in the country the representatives of the two greatest propaganda forces in the world, that these Nationals are not making their influence felt both in public and legislative matters? Are approximately eleven million people, well organized and apparently well supplied with money, passing up the chance to further a cause they are ordered to espouse?

You can have no doubt in your minds but that these minorities, knowing an election was due in 1940, knowing in 1938 that a World War was inevitable, placed their house in order to win for themselves such positions as would enable them to best serve their own interest and the interest of those whom they served.

So we're now in the United States early in the Spring of 1938, in a restless country, a country of many and large minorities, a country with more than ordinary undercurrents and cross purposes among its people.

The start of the White War was hardly noticed by the man on the street. But a pattern even then was there to be seen, a pattern that now has become clearly visible, a pattern designed to do all those things necessary to keep the United States from aiding its former Allies in any shape, manner or form, a pattern designed to prevent aid, whether it be in the form of men, money or material—Army, Navy or Air Force—a pattern designed to be worked out by propaganda.

At the start of the White War, the propaganda groups in the United States were many and had varied forms, and not all of them were bad. Who can quarrel with patriotic groups who believe their country to be the finest on earth and honestly think America can lick the world? I can't. All that is wrong with them is that they just don't know geography and physics, and I'm not going to attempt to educate them because they are much happier the way they are.

But I do quarrel with the propaganda groups in the

United States who designed the pattern and are now working it out. Let us see who they are.

The first group comprises the Totalitarian Nationals, the Germans and the Italians and their friends. We may not like what they do and how they do it, but in a neutral country, they are entitled to do their work within that country's laws, and if they do not, we have the right to point out their defections to the proper authorities.

The next group are the Democracies. I only mention them lest you note the omission and wonder at the reason. As far as any regulated propaganda effort is concerned, it has been prohibited, and we friends of the Empire in the United States moan and growl when we think of the missed opportunities. I myself spent much time and much effort trying to get the "powers that be" in England to let us in America tell the truth about England. But it was to no avail. I was told that the truth always does come out in the end and that there was no need to hurry it. Luckily, circumstances over which these gentlemen had no control have advanced the situation immeasurably. I suppose I shall live to hear them say they foresaw these circumstances. If I do, I shall ask them why they didn't warn Mr. Churchill before Dunkerque.

And then we come to the special-interest groups, and they are the ones that have caused most of the vacillating thought in the United States.

Take the Irish for example. The bulk of them are from Southern Ireland, and they are for nothing much of any consequence, except their Church. But how they are against England! They don't know why, and it's no use arguing with them, but in the hands of skillful organizers with money, they are a power.

Take the Jews for another case. Of all the people on earth who should be solidly pro-English, they are the ones. But here is something of what happened. You will recall the Palestine difficulties of a few years ago. Well, that has been capitalized to produce thinking like this: "Sure Hitler is everything you say. He has been worse than brutal to us. But look at England. She let Hitler do all

these things to us. Look how she has treated us in Palestine. She is against us just the same as Hitler." Clever organization and money can lead to thinking as absurd as this.

Take the Pacifists. They mean well but they wouldn't get far without organization and money. So, it is supplied, and opposition to furnishing aid to Britain takes on a new alias, "Pacifism."

Then we have the Non-Interventionists, and the Isolationists—those who believe in national bachelorhood for the United States. A few of them probably mean well, but their place in the sun could be identified by the banner, "No aid to Britain."

I could go on discussing the disguises of special groups indefinitely. I could discuss the subversive groups, such as the Communists, and describe how they are used to muddy the waters—an interesting subject in itself.

There were other agencies helping to disturb us. On every side there were and are books and pamphlets sold or given away under innocuous titles, but poison, pure poison, inside. And many of them have famous names for authors, but they weren't written under the urge for self-expression. They were produced by subsidy for a purpose, and the purpose in its ultimate end was "No aid to Britain."

And then we had those that to-day we would call the fifth columnists. The German Bund, I suppose, is a typical example. Under the guise of Americanism, they promoted the interest of their German masters. And how well schooled they were in the dissemination of subversive propaganda by word of mouth in the lower social strata.

Then there was the *Frei Verein für das Deutschthum in Ausland*, the German organization that looks after the organization of Germans abroad. Do you know that every year for seven years some thirty thousand young German-Americans and Americans, certainly not all of German stock, were sent abroad under total or partial subsidy to see Germany? That they were well educated to do fifth column and propaganda work in this country is well

known. Do you know that all these young people, who saw friends or relatives in Germany, are to-day in America almost as much in the Hitler Army as if they wore the swastika? Let one of them refuse the bidding of a Consul, and a letter or cable comes from Germany announcing a friend or relative in a concentration camp. The Nazis were smart enough to list these people and now they use them to force their will upon these young people. And that will now directs them in propaganda and espionage, and probably will soon direct them in sabotage. They are a force to be reckoned with.

Have I made my point clear? The pattern of the propaganda calls for the support of a purpose which tends to delay and prevent, or does prevent, aid to Britain. Honest purpose is thus prostituted. Delays are set up. Public opinion is divided. Unrest becomes bewilderment. All this because those against Britain are skilled in organization and have money.

How can these things come about? How can public opinion be thus swayed? The answer is simple—men and money and the tools that are available for use.

The tabloid newspaper and picture section of some other papers have increased the general reading of the masses, and their head-line style and use of pictures permits the telling of a story, the building and supporting of an untruth, in a way that cannot be approached in ordinary journalism.

And there is the radio—the propagandists' pal.

How different things are when compared with the last World War. Then censorship really meant control. We had a chance to remain neutral, in thought at least, if we wanted to. How different to-day. We in the United States can no longer isolate ourselves from either news or propaganda. We are exposed to an avalanche of words against our wills and regardless of our capacity to absorb or discriminate.

It would be bad enough if we only heard the news reported by standard news agencies. But we are forced to listen to this news through the voices of commentators who

sometimes reflect the size of their pay check or the views of their sponsors in biased sensationalism or subsidized inference. Our passions are aroused not only by facts, but by distortions of facts.

Every day, and every hour of the day, in some guise or other, we listen to doctrines that have destroyed liberty in a large part of the world. A check-up on who pays for this produces interesting findings.

It would be bad enough if we had available to our people only the facts and distortion of facts that emanate from our own sources, but radio passes freely over boundaries. Thus, we have boring in on us from abroad and disturbing our national consciousness, the propaganda of those who would set our minds to a task of their own choosing. And how skilfully it all is done. How well do they play their hand. How well they know that it is a rare mind that can truly evaluate a statement made in the tempo of radio. How well they know that the average radio listener is less critical, less intelligent and less educated than the average of those who are exposed to the printed word. How well they know how to use this unseen force to exploit us.

We're now at midsummer, 1938, still unrest, still undercurrents, still cross purposes, more politics than heretofore and increasing propaganda. We hear it constantly on every side as each innocent organization beseeches high heaven to behold how it grinds its axe to the everlasting glory of America.

This of which I speak, gentlemen, is not hindsight. I saw this pattern of which I speak; I saw it working out. It's there for everyone to see.

Can you blame the man on the street in the United States if he is a bit bewildered and if he does not seem sufficiently pro-British to suit some of you? Remember, he is an American first. That's where his home is.

Perhaps I had better give you a sample of how the propaganda worked. A good example, I believe, would be the British War Debts. To discuss these, we have to go back to 1922. At that time, Great Britain owed the

United States \$4,080,000,000. This was about a quarter of what was owed to Britain by her Allies and Germany.

Britain then negotiated a settlement of her debt and started payments under this settlement in December 1923. Every year thereafter, until December 1930, every payment of interest and principal was met. Britain made total payments to the United States of \$2,025,000,000.

You will recall the financial debacle of the early 1930's. You will realize the absolute impossibility of Great Britain then making payments to the United States because payments of this nature can only be paid in goods and services or in gold. Payment could not be made in goods and services because in 1930 the United States erected the Smoot-Hawley Tariff against imported goods. Britain could not part with her gold or her capital assets abroad and retain her economic position, hold her budget in balance and keep her currency and finances on a sound basis. The United States could not have its cake and eat it too. If the door were closed against Britain's goods, the same closed door kept out Britain's gold.

These are facts. Let us be thankful they were as they were. Had Britain kept on forcing herself to make payments in opposition to sound economics, think how badly off she, and the United States, would be to-day.

But in 1932, the anti-British propagandists seized on Britain's so-called default, and by 1934 they had done their work, or at least the first part of it. The Johnson Act was passed, decreeing that no foreign debtor could obtain credits from America unless it had paid its debts in full. Check the date, 1934, in the Hitler history book, and you may sense the relationship between cause and effect.

But this wasn't enough. Skilled propagandists constantly giped at what they called the dishonourable default of an honourable debt. They made no allowance for conditions though everyone in every country in the world was either forgiving debts or being forgiven. They seized upon years when Britain showed a budget surplus to point out Britain's defections from honourable practice, and this they kept up day after day. They demanded that Britain

cease her preparedness programme and use the money to pay her debts instead. How glad the American people are to-day that Britain did not succumb to this pressure.

But how few people in the United States knew these facts. I firmly believe that until recently, and because of propaganda, at least 90 per cent of the people in the United States believed that Britain had made a complete default on her debts.

No longer do we hear that Great Britain will fight to the last American dollar. Great Britain's contribution in the last war, during the time when the United States was getting ready, is now being recognized. Britain's contribution in blood is at last recognized as far surpassing our dollars.

We are now at the end of September 1938. Munich is over, and we don't like it. What had the Czechs done to deserve this? What was wrong with the Democracies? Could not Hitler be stopped? And this fellow, Chamberlain, with his umbrella, what about him? Was he an old woman, or what?

How little we knew of the facts. No one told us that as early as March, Mr. Chamberlain in an effort to help the Czechs had announced that in the event of unprovoked aggression against Czechoslovakia, British neutrality could not be counted on, and that in August, Sir John Simon had said the same thing. And this in spite of no agreement of any kind re assistance to Czechoslovakia. No one told us that in the early weeks of September, Mr. Chamberlain had suddenly come to a realization of how ill-prepared Britain was to enforce her demands. And we did not know how strong Hitler really was. We did not realize that conditions were as they were.

How few of us in America knew Mr. Chamberlain at the time. True, he was Prime Minister and must be a man of parts, but we did not in any degree consider him as really measuring up to his high post. You see we had not been told enough about him. We knew he was a business man, but that did not help. Our experience with business men in high places was not too encouraging. We did not

know, or had forgotten, his work at the Treasury where as Chancellor, by sound methods he had put British finances into sound condition. We did not know that he was the housekeeper in Mr. Baldwin's household. We did not know that his great ambition was to put across a great programme of social reform. We will never know how much it hurt to give up his plans for the betterment of the people and accept plans for armament instead. We did not recognize him in his true light. We did not know the background of appeasement.

We did not understand. We took propaganda for truth, and Britain lost caste with us.

Let us pass Munich, and pass over time until March 1939. It is nine months since we reviewed the American situation. We find it much the same as before only "more so". But the "more so" particularly applies to our opinion of Britain because we have found out how ill-prepared she really is, and it disturbs us. We believe Hitler means war, and with England ill-prepared, well, it looks bad all around, and not too good for us.

And then Hitler marches into Bohemia and Moravia and nothing happens. What's wrong, we ask? Isn't England ever going to stop this? None of us ever asks ourselves why we always expect England to do the work, especially when there are other people more vitally concerned.

Then comes the Polish Corridor episode. "That's fine," we say when Chamberlain says that German use of force in Danzig means war. John Bull is waking up. He is about ready to go.

We hear of the negotiations with Russia. That sounds like the John Bull of old—always the diplomat. *Semper paratus*, not a bad phrase that. Then a stunning blow—the Hitler-Stalin Alliance. Our old friend has fallen off the pedestal again.

Germany then moves in on Poland. Britain declares war. We are proud of her, but disturbed. We did not know that all France and Britain could possibly do was lend Poland moral support. When Russia came in and

Poland was ravaged and cut apart without an apparent move on the part of France and Britain, we could not understand it. No one explained to us that there was nothing that could be done, but plenty of propaganda was supplied to show us how France and Britain, who were able to help if they would, had selfishly let Poland down.

Then the Russians went into Finland, a country for whom we have a very high regard. And we were almost as mad at the British for what they didn't do, as we were at the Russians for what they did. We never stopped to find out if Britain had a reason for intervention or to appraise her ability to help in a practical way, nor did we stop to figure the consequences of war on divided fronts. Nobody told us of these things, but we were told plenty about England's faults of omission and commission. When little Finland went down, we wrongfully lost a lot of faith in Britain, and through no fault of Britain at all. We did not know and we did not think.

As Finland surrenders, by reason of all the things of which I have spoken, is it any wonder that our man on the street is in a mental condition that gives his views a strange complexion to Canadians who have not been under the pressure of propaganda and have had the single incentive of war to guide their thoughts and direct their actions?

We are now in the middle of March, this year, and we are not at all happy. Between the war, the third-term issue, and our doubts we don't know where to turn. We are starting to think a bit about the future. What if Hitler isn't stopped? What does this activity in the Far East mean? Too bad we haven't a two-ocean Navy.

And all the time, the propaganda is in our ears or before our eyes.

The Daladier Government falls. We see Chamberlain constantly on the defensive. "Why can't those people get together?" we ask. "You can't win a war this way." At this moment, the propagandist whispers in our ear, "They're falling apart. Watch Hitler now."

As we watched England take a beating in Norway, saw Hitler invade the Low Countries and force their capitul-

ation, and saw Belgium surrender, we were shocked and angered, and we looked to our weapons. At that moment, something akin to panic struck us. We found that if the Germans should suddenly win, capture the British and French Navies, and turn their war machine on us, we had no adequate defence. We were like the England we had deprecated a short while before.

But just then Churchill came in, and his ringing words gave us heart. We saw what happened at Dunkerque. The glory in that debacle thrilled us to the core. History was repeating itself. As at Crécy, Waterloo, Cape Trafalgar, Ypres, when the chips are down and the smoke gets thick something happens to the blood of British men of action, and they prove again that it is spirit, not equipment, that wins battles for those of our heritage.

That epic of history gave us heart. Too bad this had to happen, but it proved there is nothing really wrong with England. Give her time, and she will muddle through again. We must help her a bit, but we must look to our own knitting as well.

Then Italy came in, and France went out. England was left alone.

As she faced her enemy, and as we faced to-morrow, we asked ourselves the same question, "Can we defend ourselves?" Our answer was, "In time". But Britain's answer was in action. With what she had, she went "all out", and as she did, how she won us to her! In no country in the world does sheer guts get the acclaim it does with us. And England has been showing us sheer guts every hour, every day, ever since she took the task on alone.

As we took stock of ourselves, we watched Britain take hold of herself. We saw her make the sacrifices she should have made earlier. We saw her accept responsibilities she formerly had evaded. We admiringly saw come back into being the Britain of history.

As we watched and worked and thought, we listened to propaganda. But no longer did its varied plea divert us

as it had. We now had a purpose, a resolve. We must make ready to defend America.

As we measured the task and saw the time-lag that dilatory tactics had forced on us, we suddenly came to a realization that the British were fighting our enemy. They were holding him back and weakening his force. They were giving us time to prepare. They prevented the French Fleet from possibly being used against us. They were protecting our Atlantic front while our Navy was in the Pacific. They were giving us the chance to defend ourselves at a distance while war was kept out of America.

With this realization, our viewpoint changed. No longer did we search for an excuse for not helping; we accepted almost any excuse that would help us to give aid. It might almost be said that the British forces came to be recognized as our first line of defence and that our primary duty become one of keeping them in supply. As we plunged into the task of developing our own armaments, in building a two-ocean Navy, and assembling and training an Army, we turned to every side to ask "What have we here we can send now?"

Britain's furnishing us with Atlantic bases was genuinely appreciated, and though the propagandists tried to build up a different story, the bases were accepted by us more as the friendly evidence of a new partnership than anything else.

We were glad to send the destroyers, everything else to the contrary. More will be sent if they can be spared. Don't pay any attention when you hear discussion pro and con regards this. Just remember this is an election year, and let it go at that.

By now the propaganda has changed, not only in volume, but in purpose as well. We hear new slogans on every side—"Defend America," "Aid Britain," "Defend America by Helping the Allies." "Even the old slogan, "Make the World Safe for Democracy," is polished up and trotted out again. This propaganda has all-American sources. Mercy ships are proposed to bring English kiddies to us. The Neutrality Act is changed. Open

forums are held to discuss the rescinding of the Johnson Act. Daily you hear folks say that our "Cash and Carry" policy must go overboard.

As bombs fall over Britain, for the first time we soberly contemplate whether, or when, we should enter the war.

Figures tell part of the story. If polls can cross-section public opinion, then the Gallup Poll reflects our thinking.

Last May, when our people were asked whether it was more important for the United States to try to keep out of the war ourselves or to help England win, even at the risk of getting into the war, only 36 per cent said "Help England." But in September, 52 per cent were aligned with Britain.

These figures do not mean that we desire to go to war. Nothing could be further from the truth. For us to make war, we must first have a cause or an incident. We have neither up to now. Even a sudden untoward incident, might not make us cast the die. For a great nation, such as we are, to go to war, the aggregate angers of a hundred million people must be loosened and merged into a rushing tidal wave of public opinion. No such condition exists to-day. As a nation we may have ceased being neutral, if ever we were. We may have become anti-Nazi, or pro-British, but we are definitely not now for war.

We have now moved with history up to a few weeks ago, up to that day when Germany, Italy and Japan announced their understandings. These did not, as intended, create fear within us. We were not prepared to accept a warning that we should stay out of the war and not continue to aid Britain, lest we find ourselves in war both in Europe and Asia. We declined to supinely accept other nations' dictates that from now on control of Europe is in the hands of Italy and Germany and control of Asia in the hands of Japan. We opposed the thesis that if we did not accept the foregoing, Europe and Asia would soon be found against us in South America.

Why was our back now so stiff? Did we not know what Hitler might do if he won in the near future?

Yes, we know what faces us if Britain falls. Hitler, with the greatest armada in world history, will probably

come over and collect tribute from us. We will pay or see our seaboard cities laid waste. That does not concern us, because for Hitler to win, Britain must fall, and we now all know that Britain is not going to fall. Long before that happens, and better prepared than now, we will be found at Britain's side to ensure her victory.

From this day on, common sense, self-interest and humanity's cause require that we maintain and intensify our efforts to aid Britain. We shall not fail. Under safe skies, spurred on by the spirit and faith shown us by Britain, we will meet Britain's every need, and maybe yet, be one with her.

How easy it would be for me, as I close, to use a favoured artifice and win your approbation by indulging in prophecy prompted by some wishful thinking. I could look forward to the day when side by side, with flags entwined, in democracy's cause, we marched forward to a united victory. Such a prophecy is built to order for a speechmaker in search of a finale.

There is insufficient basis at present for even the suggestion of such a thing. We are with you, but we cannot see that far ahead as yet. We must move step by step and prepare as we go.

I would like to leave you with the feeling of the man on the street in the United States, and I think I can do it best in these words:

"This is my song,
 Oh God of all the nations,
 A song of Peace, of lands afar in mind.
 This is my home, the country where my heart is,
 This is my hope, my dreams, my shrine.
 But other hearts in other lands
 Still beat with hopes and dreams the same as mine.
 My country's skies are bluer than the ocean
 The sunlight beams on clover leaf and pine,
 But other lands have clover leaf, too, and sunshine,
 And skies are often blue as mine.
 Hear my song, thou God of all the nations,
 A song of Peace, for other lands and mine."

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON: Gentlemen, I am going to ask a very old friend of Dr. Goggin's, our guest's father, to say a word of appreciation.

DR. H. J. CODY: Mr. President, may I in your name express to Mr. Victor Goggin our profound gratitude for this splendid speech. It has been a masterly analysis of the conditions in the United States. It has made us realize the difficulty of the problem of uniting the United States behind one definite policy. It has been a splendid and accurate statement of the development, from point to point, of American public opinion, until, as he has said to-day, there is the desire on the part of the majority of the people in the United States to do all they can, short of going actually into the war, to give material aid and moral support to Great Britain.

I have been tremendously impressed by this address. I know you all have been and would wish to thank Mr. Goggin.

May I add something, just a sentence, that he couldn't say and wouldn't say. He is the head, as you know, of the Maple Leaf Fund, organized in the United States to secure financial support for various phases of Canadian war activity on the home front and overseas. Among other things, not long ago, through his kind offices, we at the University of Toronto were presented with a generous check to enable up to help pay for the expense involved in settling some British mothers and British children, wives of professors and sons and daughters of teachers in British Universities, and thanks to the timely aid, we were able to place safely twenty-two mothers and one hundred and forty-seven children. (Applause.) In your presence I would like to thank him for all he has done.

May I once more then, in your name, present to him our heartfelt thanks. We, in the old homeland, always rejoice when a son goes abroad and does well for himself and well for the country and well for the great cause of human freedom and justice and mercy under whose banner

we all wish to think, work and pray, and give and fight.
(Applause.)

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON: It always happens, when I ask Dr. Cody to do anything, he steals my thunder. However, the Doctor has done it exceedingly well and much better than I could.

On the suggestion of the President, the Honourable G. Howard Ferguson, K.C., it was agreed that the Empire Club of Canada should send a message of greetings and good wishes to the British Empire Club of Providence, Rhode Island, on the occasion of the celebration of its twenty-fifth anniversary.

“THE TWENTIETH CENTURY CRUSADE AT HOME AND ABROAD”

AN ADDRESS BY

JOHN COLLINGWOOD READE.

Chairman: The President, The Honourable G. Howard
Ferguson.

Thursday, November 24, 1940

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON: Gentlemen: My duty to-day is a real pleasure. It is to introduce in the flesh one whom we all know by voice and perhaps by spirit. I know my family household sits up late at night waiting to hear John Collingwood Reade tell which way the world is turning and how the fortunes of the various nations are developing. We have learned to regard his broadcasts, his commentaries, I might say, as the best we get, and they have in them that cheery, grim and gay confidence that Churchill talks about, and we all go to bed, prepared to sleep the sounder for having had the benefit of his comments on the situation. He has had a remarkable career himself. I will not go over it in detail—I don't know enough about it—but he has tried a whack at the sea, he has done something in literature and he has spoken before a great many other organizations. At any rate, he has had an opportunity of making contact with a great variety of influences which I think tend to round out one's character and give one a broader outlook on life. From what we hear ourselves from him, I am quite sure that he has made good use of the opportunities that have presented themselves to him. I have thought so frequently, when I have heard him, that I can trace the Clive blood

that still runs through his veins. You all remember what Clive did in India—he laid the foundations for British Imperial organization in India. The Collingwoods were among the great Admirals on the sea and to-day we have traced down through generations, some few hundred years, one of the offspring, who now, I am sure, will entertain and inform us in a very interesting way. (Applause.)

MR. JOHN COLLINGWOOD READE: Gentlemen: These are very stirring times. As we sit here to-day, there is going on throughout the world, not only a great war, which before it is finished will involve much more of the world than did the war of 1914-1918, but also a social revolution which began at the time of the depression of 1929 and will not be finished until some time after peace has been restored. The world is now dividing itself into three great camps: the Axis combination of Germany, Italy and Japan; the Democracies, or what is left of them; and Russia.

I suppose we can agree that the underlying causes of this conflict are essentially matters of economic organization; that it is to say, there would have been a great conflict of interests in any case, but this conflict would have been settled amicably had it not been for the arrogant temperament of the present rulers of Germany and Italy. We are witnessing the last stages in the transition of society from one in which capital was predominant to one in which the ordinary man is to be predominant.

In different periods of the world's history, humanity has set different classes of people in authority. Before there was any system of social order under a national government, the warrior was the most important person in the community. Warrior chieftains became knights in medieval Europe and were rewarded with grants of land for their services to the King. From this was developed the feudal system, in which the Lord of the Manor parcelled out the land to be worked among the serfs and demanded military service in return.

In other periods of the world's history, the priests held the reins of power. Having the monopoly of education, they were the sole dispensers of a culture for which the people were beginning to yearn. Then the merchant princes sat in the high places. They controlled and manipulated the supply of gold and silver, established connections abroad, built fleets of ships and dealt in spices, fruits, leather and hides, exchanging the natural products of the Occident for the spices and silks of the Orient.

Then came mechanical power. The merchant princes were dethroned, and the industrialists reigned in their stead. The use of power on a larger and larger scale created a great demand for capital. The world had to save and invest in order to equip itself with gigantic engines, tools and building-things which were not consumed, in order that they could multiply their output of things that were to be consumed. That was the day of the financier-industrialist.

Now, to a large extent that era has passed as well. Depressions of glut are our portion, and not of scarcity. An economy which was adapted to the encouragement of thrift in order to provide support for those engaged in producing capital goods, plant and machinery, had been found ill-adapted to secure the distribution of the plethora which that machinery could make. Since 1929 we have seen a progressive departure from the orthodox practices which governed the administration of finance before the last war.

And if that has been true in the science of national housekeeping, it has been even more true in the external dealings of nations. The last war had altered the balance of international indebtedness. Where, before, the producers of raw materials were in debt to the great manufacturing nations and were always able to satisfy their obligations by delivering materials, the last war hastened the industrialization of the new world and transferred the balance of indebtedness across the Atlantic.

The new world, anxious to preserve the industrial empires which had newly arisen and shield itself from

the competition of nations living on a lower standard, tried to keep out the industrial products of Europe and Asia and, at the same time, collect its debts. The channels of international trade became blocked, and the only commodity which could jump the tariff walls was gold. Gold fled from Europe, currencies became deflated and rose on exchange. America found it increasingly difficult to sell abroad except by dumping excess products at prices lower than the prevailing domestic price. Some nations, notably Germany, were compelled to abandon all pretence of adhering to international financial practices and began to deal amongst themselves on a barter basis. A cleavage was made between the barter nations and the free currency nations.

There was such a degree of paralysis in the world's commercial system that poverty and insecurity were everywhere to be found. And it was man's search for some measure of security which promoted the growth of these strange state religions such as Naziism and Fascism. They seemed to be the easy way out of a perplexing dilemma. They provided a symbol and an ideal upon which the people could fix their emotions in a drab and sordid commercial world. They offered a rationalization of the people's desires. They provided a purpose toward the attainment of which the people could apply their energies. In the Fascist or Nazi state, there was a place for everyone. There were no unwanted men and, as all work was directed toward the greater glory of the state, self-respect was restored to the people.

But they sold their birthright for a mess of pottage. They seized upon the obvious comforts. Tired of the weary quest for a just way of life, exhausted by the tedious struggle to discharge their personal responsibilities and make their own adjustment to society, they gladly relinquished to the state their responsibility as individuals.

The Democracies have gone about it otherwise. They, too, have yearned for economic security. They, too, have sickened of the sordid struggle for advantage. They, too, have realized that a new set of standards and a new

social morality are required. They, too, have realized that the struggle with Nature to wrest from her the means of subsistence is nearly over, and that the fruits of that conquest are available in abundant measure. Extreme poverty is an anachronism and because it is no longer necessary, it has become a social vice.

But the democratic people will not, to win security, surrender their responsibilities nor their freedom of choice. They will find their security through their own efforts. Voluntary association for the better accomplishment of their purposes and a just temper in distributing the products of their energy—these are the means through which they will find peace and plenty.

Fascist and Communist states, all-powerful and all-demanding, reduce the human entity to a mere cipher and place in the hands of the rulers a power greater than weak mortals can use with wisdom and justice, and a responsibility too heavy for frail shoulders to bear. Even if men of unusual greatness are found in the beginning to direct the destinies of the totalitarian states, the problem of finding successors of equal stature is one which has never been solved. Power so concentrated and so absolute breeds an appetite for power. Because the modern state is so complex, it is departmentalized. In the totalitarian states, only an infinitesimal fragment of the whole is either seen by, or revealed to, any person or group of persons. Functions, responsibilities and authority pyramid gradually toward the top. Men become marionettes, with the strings that control their every movement passing up through the curtain to be gathered together in one hand—the hand of the man who is their god, to whom they must look and whom they must obey, because he alone can co-ordinate the thousands of complex functions and give them meaning.

This way of life is not acceptable to us. It terrifies us. We know that once human society loses its flexibility, it can no longer evolve and develop. Men, like the ants and bees, would go about their daily tasks blindly and with no personal purpose, behaving from the day of their birth to

the day of their death according to some pre-arranged pattern. A dismal prospect!

One of the most terrible features of a totalitarian state is the fact that it produces of necessity a set of sanctions all its own. One has only to read excerpts from newspapers in Germany and Russia to realize how radically different their mode of thought, their attitude of mind, their means of expression are from our own. No longer do they reason with their people. They exhort them, they inflame their passions or they restate the articles of belief to which they must subscribe. It is impossible, therefore, for the totalitarian powers to negotiate or arbitrate with powers who are not similarly constituted. They cannot compromise. For them, truth is absolute, right is positive, wrong is positive, and all these values are tested against their own dogma, which is a bundle of superstitions and beliefs concocted to rationalize their own unspoken desires and to serve their present purposes.

When Mr. Churchill talks about "those wicked men", about "the Nazi pestilence driving Europe toward a new Dark Age", this is what he is talking about. He is talking about a form of social organization that has made ciphers of men; that has monopolized information so that it may suppress those facts and those ideas which do not coincide with its doctrine. He is talking about an order of things which, to preserve itself, must destroy the critical faculty, substitute indoctrination for education, awe for respect, fear for love. And, because it cannot live at peace in a community of nations which does not worship the same gods or cling to the same beliefs, it must set about subjugating them or perish itself.

Mr. Winston Churchill, that man of vision who has come at last into his own, has said, and said rightly, that Hitler's plan is to make of all Europe one drab uniform and regimented Boche Land. That indeed is Hitler's plan, because bigotry and utter servility to any dogma and any creed knows no other method of survival than to suppress all that are not in agreement with it. This is what the British Empire is fighting, together with its Allies that

have escaped from the lands that have been overrun by the Germans and are fighting now at Britain's side.

Before the time shall come when the social life of the world can be established on a just and sure foundation, we must rid the world of this pestilence of totalitarianism. When that task is done—when the war is finished—we must reconstruct the organization of our daily lives. We must reapportion duties and rewards. We must recognize the rights of all men. We must cease to measure success in terms of monetary returns. We must take a nobler view of human destiny. We must trade with each other out of our abundance and not bargain with each other on the basis of artificial scarcity. The economic resources of the world must be made available to all nations .

The old order changeth, giving place to the new. When the hour of victory shall have come, the terms of peace must be dictated in a different spirit. The last peace was a peace of rewards and punishments. The allied nations set a price upon their services and were rewarded with grants of territory and by the creation of buffer states to protect them from their enemies—states which were created for no other purpose and were not founded on the needs of the people who occupied them who, themselves, were not consulted. The Central Powers were punished and forced to pay reparations which ruined them and finally brought the victors down with them to a common economic catastrophe.

Perhaps it is well that France collapsed. Perhaps it is well that upon the British Empire alone rests the awful responsibility of cleansing Europe from the scourge. The British Government now represents a cross-section of humanity. Differences of class and interest have been sunk. Pride and prejudice have fled. Victory has been won on the home front in Britain, and because she has won at home, she will be victorious abroad. (Applause.) The great days of Merry England have returned under a great Elizabethan, Winston Churchill, and noble and yeoman, banker and miner, have sunk their differences, put their grievances behind them and joined hands to

share together the greatness which has come upon them all. The Knights of St. George are on their last Crusade. The terms of the new peace will be devised by the British, and I think we may hope by the British alone. (Applause.) I think that most of us will agree that it would be much better, both for the people of the United States and for the people of Europe, if the kindly understanding, the willing co-operation, the general community of effort which has already been established between the two governments remains on the basis upon which it has already been established. The terms of this new peace then, will in all probability be devised by the British, a people who have no continental ambitions, no Allies to reward, no powers to palliate, a people who have purged their own hearts and minds of greed and hate.

I would like to conclude what I have to say by recalling to your memory the ringing challenge and faithful promise of Winston Churchill in that epic speech on Monday afternoon to the French people: "Good night, then. Sleep to gather strength for the morning, for the morning will come. Brightly will it shine on the brave and the true—kindly on all who suffer for the cause—glorious upon the tombs of heroes. Thus will shine the dawn. Vive la France! Long live also the forward march of the common people in all the lands toward their just and true inheritance and toward the broader and fuller age."

That age to which the British Prime Minister referred has nothing to do with military victory but is concerned with the far more difficult task which will face the British people when the time comes, when they shall have to decide for the world what is to be the basis upon which peace shall be established. Thank you. (Applause—prolonged.)

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON: Gentlemen, I am sure all of you would like me to express on your behalf, as well as my own, our very warm gratitude to Mr. John Collingwood Reade for coming here to-day and dealing with this situation in perhaps what is a novel

method to most of us, giving us an historic review, a sort of picture of the development of the conditions that have brought about the situation that prevails in the world to-day. I think perhaps there has been too little understanding of the causes which developed the very nationalistic spirit that has led to friction and conflict and the outrageous situation that exists in Europe at the present time.

I think we all will agree with him, too, in what is the inevitable conclusion of what he says, that it is a good thing that Britain and Britain alone has assumed the responsibility of carrying on this fight to secure liberty for everybody in the world. (Applause.) When the day comes, after the enemy is crushed and resistance overcome, it will want a combined, a single purpose, it will want a nation with power and influence and strength, a combination of peoples such as prevail in the British Empire, with the prestige they have, with the long history for the betterment and improvement of man—it will require a people like that, not only to negotiate but to a large extent to dictate upon what terms the enemy shall be allowed to continue, if at all, as a national unit.

When one reads history one cannot help feeling that this is a phase of it that is not at all new. We have gone through these things in years gone by and in every case, right eventually has prevailed—and right, re-enforced, stimulated and led with all the advantage and power that is behind it to-day in the British outlook on the world, must inevitably prevail in this case.

Anybody who has got any doubts about it—I think there are few people that have—have only to listen daily, or read in the newspapers daily, to determine which is the great characteristic of the most insignificant and humble of the Britishers. Jerry can't get us down, and that is the spirit that prevails all over the British Empire to-day. We feel that just as strongly, I believe, in this country, among the large majority of the people here, but because we are not immediately in contact, seeing day after day the revolting sights of promiscuous destruction of property, of

the murder of innocent women and children, we don't feel it as they must feel it over there.

I have, and no doubt many of you have, the privilege of receiving occasional letters from over there. My wife gets a great many letters and notwithstanding the tone of horror and shock and sorrow, running through it all is a vein of confidence and the power of endurance. They are looking with confidence to the outcome.

In tracing, as Mr. Reade has so well and eloquently done, the causes that led up to the present situation, he came through the different phases of evolution in British life. He didn't emphasize as much as he might have, all the influences that made for character among the English people, and after all character is a thing that counts in the world, whether it is in private life, business life, social activity or public service.

When you go through England you wonder why there is a church at every crossroads. That, Gentlemen, in my belief, is at the very basis of English character and English life. Their whole social structure, and I hope ours as well, is founded upon the broad and sound doctrine of the brotherhood of man and the right of the individual to act and talk and worship as he may, abstaining from impinging upon the rights of others to do the same. Out of that situation, stimulated by that historic background, we have developed a social system upon which our whole life is based and if reverse should come to the arms of Britain at the present time the whole foundation and structure of modern life and freedom would be destroyed. That is recognized the world over.

I apologize—I got up here to thank Mr. Reade for what I thought was a most delightful address. I am not attempting to supplement it. I do very, very sincerely, Sir, thank you for coming here and giving us this delightful review, in an historical way, of the position of the various nations involved and the influences directing the situation of to-day. (Applause.)

"THE WAR AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR CANADA AND THE EMPIRE"

AN ADDRESS BY

SIR HOWARD D'EGVILLE, K.B.E., LL.D.

Chairman: The President, The Honourable G. Howard
Ferguson.

Thursday, October 31, 1940

A Joint Meeting of the Empire Club of Canada and the Canadian Club was held in the Royal York Hotel, Toronto, on Thursday, October 31, 1940.

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON: Gentlemen: I have a very pleasant duty to perform to-day, that is to present to you one who is by no means unknown in Canada, having visited here and visited the City of Toronto on former occasions, as far back as 1913, I think. I have had the pleasure of being able to regard him as a very personal friend. During the time I was in England his high offices were at the service of Canada House, in fact at the service of all the Dominion representatives. As perhaps you know, Sir Howard d'Egville was the founder of the Empire Parliamentary Association, away back before the Great War. The function or purpose of the organization has been carried out very faithfully and I think it has served an excellent purpose. The idea was to promote contact, create uniformity of standards and ideals and methods amongst members of the Parliaments of the Empire, and particularly to develop personal relations and to exchange information. Sir Howard presided over the organization in that magnificent and historic old spot—

Westminster Palace Hall, built as you know, in the time of Rufus. Also, the place where a number of people have been executed, is just in front of his door.

In connection with his work, Sir Howard has been a great success, throughout all the Dominions, in creating branches of his organization and carrying on the work for which the organization was originally founded. He is the host of all Dominion Members from the overseas Dominions that come to Great Britain and you always feel that it gives him a great deal of pleasure to introduce those who come from overseas, not only to his palatial headquarters, that historic old hall, but to Members of the British Parliament.

It gave me the greatest pleasure in the world when Sir Howard kindly accepted our invitation to discuss with us briefly the war and its implications, not only in Great Britain but in the Dominions as well, and particularly in Canada. I have now the very great pleasure indeed of asking him to talk to us for a few moments. (Applause.)

SIR HOWARD D'EGVILLE, K.B.E., LL.D.: Mr. Ferguson and Gentlemen of the Empire and the Canadian Clubs: I understand that though the invitation was from the Empire Club, I am especially honoured and privileged to-day to address a joint meeting of both the Empire Club and the Canadian Club.

My old friend, Mr. Ferguson, shortly after my arrival in Canada, was good enough to say that he would like me to address the Empire Club during my visit. I therefore feel a little bit like the man, who having been called upon by the Chairman to speak, held forth for a considerable length of time and at the end of about an hour people were beginning to get fidgety. However, the only sign of his being likely to stop occurred when a gentleman approached

SIR HOWARD D'EGVILLE, K.B.E., LL.D.: Mr. Ferguson, carrying a big stick, who said, "Do not mind me! I am not looking for you, I am looking for the man who called on you to speak." So, I hope, Gentlemen, that when you are disappointed, as I am afraid you will be

to-day, you will vent your wrath upon the broad shoulders of my friend, Mr. Ferguson.

Now, Mr. Ferguson has referred to the headquarters of our Empire Parliamentary Association over which I preside in Westminster Hall. There I have the privilege of receiving Legislators from every part of the British Commonwealth of Nations. I think it is especially suitable that in the birthplace of parliamentary government we should have the honour of receiving the Members of the newer Parliaments when they come to visit us in the Old Land, for you have to remember that parliamentary institutions are incomparably the greatest gift which the English people have presented to the civilization of the world. Many nations of Europe have learned of recent years the bitter lesson that freedom not rooted in history has no power of resistance to the material hardships and civil dissensions of which tyrannies are bred. The liberty enshrined to-day in the parliamentary institutions of the British Empire has been seasoned by the storms of a thousand years, and that is why celebrations in connection with Parliament and with our freedom-loving Kings have been always celebrated in the oldest shrine of liberty in the world, beneath the medieval rafters of Westminster Hall. I am sorry to have to tell you that just recently the Nazi barbarians dropped one of their messages not very far from the historic hall, which had the effect of blowing out all the windows of the offices of the Empire Parliamentary Association. It was some consolation to know that they had, at least, respect for the British week-end, because this disaster occurred on a Friday evening, and by Monday I am glad to say the windows were all in again, and we were performing our normal duty. One of the effects of this air outrage was that in the statue of Richard, the Lion-Hearted, which is just around the corner from the entrance to our rooms, the sword which Richard carries in his hand was bent but it was not broken. I think that is symbolical. Though the strength and determination of the population of London may perhaps sometimes be occasionally bent, I can assure you it will never be broken. (Ap-

plause.) I can assure you that in that far away, blacked-out city, your lion-hearted friends will be holding the fort.

Now, Gentlemen, I have chosen the title "Canada and the Empire" because I am thoroughly convinced that you people of Canada are firmly determined to remain within the British Empire. (Applause.)

Now, of what does that Empire actually consist? It consists of a number of practically independent sister nations—the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and so on; of colonies which are practically or almost self-governing; the great Empire of India, which is not self-governing; and Colonies and Protectorates such as East and West Africa, the West Indies and various other parts of the earth's surface. It is so large that sometimes when thinking of the British Empire I am reminded of the question that was put to a small boy in an examination paper, as follows: "Where are elephants found?" Not knowing the precise answer, he replied, "The elephant is such a large beast that it is very seldom lost."

One Empire being so large and being so scattered, is not so easy to defend, but in this Great War not one single portion of that Empire will be lost. (Applause.)

Now, sometimes one feels that one ought to make some excuse for the use of the word "Empire", although I hardly think it is necessary to an audience of the Empire Club. I should, however, like to call attention to a most interesting observation that was once made in an address to some of our Members in the Parliament at home by your distinguished President of the University of Toronto, Dr. Cody, when, I think, he was Minister of Education. He said, in referring to the use of the word "Empire":

"In Blackstone's Commentaries, you find these words, 'The Legislature uses *Empire* to assert that our King is sovereign and independent within these his Dominions.' Why should not we have a definite use of the term *Empire*? It does not mean that we are an organization out to dominate the world, to restrain the development of others, but it is a declaration that within

our own Dominion we claim freedom and independence from outside interference. And that, in my humble opinion, justifies abundantly the use of the fine old term that stirs our very hearts, 'the British Empire'."

Now, as you know, that Empire, and every conception of it, is based upon freedom. It consists of those who have attained the powers of self-government and those who are being assisted to reach that status, and between the conception of the British Empire of order, freedom and the reign of law, and the German idea of domination, suppression, and the so-called new world order which means universal tyranny and the reign of the gangster and the Gestapo—between those ideals there can and will be no compromise. (Applause.)

I know it is frequently suggested by those of a somewhat defeatist tendency that the causes of this war are economic. That, I think, is a misleading statement. You know, of course, that the German people had access to the markets of the British Empire. The limitations of their trade with us were limitations imposed by their own system of exchange. Therefore, the economic argument is only very partially true.

But what is true is that German policy has been directed, ever since the Hitler régime came into power, toward the domination of countries possessing the materials necessary for war, because war has been the basis of German policy. That distinguished statesman, Dr. Goebbels, said at the Leipzig Fair, in 1936, "The basic materials of modern industrialism are coal, cotton, copper, iron, oil and rubber." These also happen to be the basic materials of war industry. In all but coal and iron, Germany is deficient. Therefore, now she is turning her attention to attack those countries likely to improve her oil supply. By bringing Japan into the Axis she hopes to secure rubber, as well as oil, from British Malaya, the Netherlands East Indies and so on. Having failed in the attack on the British Isles and seeing there is no hope of securing a decision there, and let me remind you, had invasion succeeded, darkness would have fallen upon the remnant of

free Europe, upon Africa, and upon the whole of the Arab world, apart altogether from the influence, which I will deal with in a moment, upon North America—Germany having failed in this objective is now attacking those countries in order to secure the resources for war and in order to secure those strategic positions by means of which she believes she can bring the British Empire to its knees.

The vital theatre of war, then, has shifted to the Middle East. The attempt now is to dominate Yugoslavia and Bulgaria and Greece, and so control the Straits and the Aegean Sea, that ultimately Turkey may be outflanked and Germany may secure the oil supply of Irân and the Arab countries. By attacking Egypt and the Soudan, the Axis Powers mean to undermine the power of the British Empire in Asia and in Africa and eventually to control the world.

But they have to reckon with the fine military and air forces of the British Empire, now concentrated in Egypt, and above and behind all they have to reckon with the sea power of the British Fleet.

It is interesting to recall that in the Battle of the Nile in 1798, it was British sea power which destroyed the communications between France and Napoleon's army in Egypt. There has often, throughout history, been considerable misconception of sea power. During the Crimean War this was illustrated by a joke in *Punch*, which asked the question, "What is the difference between the Fleet in the Baltic and the Fleet in the Black Sea?", the answer being, "The Fleet in the Baltic was expected to do everything and it did nothing; the Fleet in the Black Sea was expected to do nothing and it did it."

But, as a matter of fact, the Fleet at that time did, and the Fleet now is doing, everything that was required in order to establish maritime supremacy. The Fleet alone enabled the war to be carried on at all. The Fleet has prevented the invasion of England in these days in the same way that the Fleet prevented the invasion of England in the Napoleonic era.

That great American writer on naval affairs, the famous author of *The Influence of Sea Power Upon History*, Captain Mahan, wrote of the British Fleet in those days, referring to the victories of Napoleon, "Those far distant storm-swept ships stood between him and the Empire of the world."

Gentlemen, what is the position of the North American continent? Hitler, by guns and bombs and by incendiaryism, has murdered and screamed his way to the domination of Germany and later, almost to the domination of Europe. What stands between him and the North American continent? It is the British Fleet.

I have lately been in the United States where I have had the privilege of meeting some distinguished public men and I must say that I think more and more that it is beginning to be recognized by many thoughtful people that the Monroe Doctrine depends upon the maintenance of British sea power. That thought was given expression the other day by your distinguished Attorney-General, whom I am glad to see with us to-day. (Applause.)

It is true, of course, that the Air Forces of the Empire, the magnificent Air Forces, have prevented, in a large measure, an attempt at invasion of our shores and they have carried the war unremittingly into the enemy's territories, thereby showing that no really vital damage has been done to our aircraft production or to our aerodromes, but behind all has been the constant day and night vigilance of the British Fleet, keeping open our lines of communication, enabling huge masses of men to be transported from one country to another and keeping the merchant shipping under the British flag. Indeed, it is a most striking fact that after a year of unlimited U-boat warfare and intensified mine attack, the British merchant fleet, the merchant fleet under the British flag, is larger than when we began the war. (Applause.) By building, by purchases and by capture, we have added over two million gross tons to the merchant navy, and large additions, of course, have escaped from captive countries. Our shipping losses have

been great, but I would remind you that the peak figures are less than the highest figure of the tonnage sunk in the last war by submarine attack alone. The menace must not be underestimated, but even if the British had not acquired the use of enormous quantities of neutral shipping and had not replaced losses by new standard ships at a rapidly increasing pace, the present rate of sinking would have to be in operation several years, not months, before Britain would be brought to starvation.

The British people, as you know, are now in the front line of the battle. The civilians have been undergoing great and terrible trials but they are facing them with an undaunted spirit. The war, however, will not be won without great sacrifices on the part of all nations of the British Commonwealth. To bring that war to a conclusion we will have to take our forces into the enemy's territory and that will require, as you know, large additions to our man-power.

Canada is a country having decisive importance upon this world conflict. I cannot say how much the people of the British Isles appreciate the great efforts which you are making in a military way, in the air and at sea, toward the co-operative war effort so essential to victory. Just before I left our shores, the First Lord of the Admiralty told me of the great thrill it had given him to go out to meet the Canadian destroyers, thereby illustrating this close co-operation upon the high seas between your great country and ours.

Canada is indeed a link of supreme importance, apart from the actual war effort, between the United States and the United Kingdom. A Canadian writer has very truly said, "When we are asked to choose between the British Empire and the United States of America, let us choose both of them"; and this recent agreement of a defensive character between the United Kingdom and the United States and the Dominion of Canada is of the greatest possible significance.

I had the honour of being present recently at "an Eastern Canadian port" and of seeing the destroyers from

the United States handed over to the Canadian Navy, and it was an experience which I shall never forget. It seems to me that these new methods of co-operation contain the germs of a great idea which with future developments will carry us through the present period of pain and tribulation and dark days of tragedy to the dawn of long and better days to come. In this great coming together, Gentlemen, of our liberty-loving nations, mostly speaking a common tongue and with a common tradition behind them, you may see something of what Hitler has accomplished. In the words of our great war leader, Mr. Churchill, "He has lighted a fire which will burn with a steady and consuming flame until the last vestiges of Nazi tyranny have been burnt out of Europe, and until the old world and the new can join hands to rebuild the Temple of man's freedom and man's honour upon foundations which will not soon or easily be overthrown." (Applause.)

MR. A. R. COURTICE (President of the Canadian Club): Gentlemen, I am sure we have all been very interested in this comprehensive address and especially in having an English gentleman's appraisal of the present position of the North American continent and of Canada's privileged position within the freedom of the British Empire. Sir Howard's description of Canada as a country of decisive importance in this struggle, I think, should impress us with the sacrifice that must be made and our responsibility in assuring that our contribution to victory measures up to our opportunities.

Sir Howard, on behalf of the Empire and the Canadian Clubs, may I first commend you for the good work that you are doing for the Empire and also thank you most sincerely for your very able address. (Applause.)

“WINGED WARFARE OVER BRITAIN”

AN ADDRESS BY

AIR MARSHAL WILLIAM A. BISHOP, V.C.,
D.S.O. (with Bar), M.C., D.F.C.

Chairman: The President, The Honourable G. Howard
Ferguson.

Thursday, November 7, 1940

A Joint Meeting of the Empire Club of Canada and the Canadian Club was held in the Royal York Hotel, Toronto, on Thursday, November 7, 1940.

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON: Gentlemen: Once long ago someone wrote or said that a prophet was not without honour save in his own country. To-day, I think we have an emphatic demonstration of the lack of truth of that statement. We have all been interested, of course, in the continuous expansion and progress that Canada has made, particularly since she became a Confederation. But we all agree that no single incident in our history gave us such status, such prominence and importance in the world of affairs as did the achievement of the Canadian boys who went out in 1914-1918. From that time we have seemed to get new inspiration, fresh encouragement and in fact new life was innoculated into the whole Canadian people. No one played a greater part in that Great War and brought greater prestige and credit to Canada than did the guest we have with us to-day, Air Marshal Bishop. Notwithstanding his size, he was able to do up seventy-two Germans, himself, I think. Now, he has taken on the whole German Army, as Air Marshal of

the Canadian Air Force, and we look forward with every confidence to the endeavours of the organization he promotes, giving an even better record, because there are larger numbers and the situation is perhaps more serious than in the last war.

It is not my purpose to say a word of introduction about Billy Bishop, personally. Everybody here knows him. The best introduction he can have and the best compliment paid him is to have before him this large audience who are interested in his work and in his career, and are here to pay him a well deserved compliment. I have, therefore, great pleasure in asking Air Marshal Bishop to address you for a short time. (Applause.)

AIR MARSHAL W. A. BISHOP, V.C., D.S.O., M.C., D.F.C.: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: It is hard for me to thank you for a welcome like that. It is very much like coming home to address this gathering here to-day in Toronto, as I have had the honour of speaking to you so many times in the past. I can assure you I appreciate that honour, and particularly in this case, so soon after my return from a short and flying visit to England.

When I say "flying visit", I must admit that when I made the decision to fly the ocean it came back vividly to my mind that for the last twenty years my New Year's resolutions have always been two; one I knew I would be able to keep—not to swim the English Channel—the other, not to fly the Atlantic. Being Irish, I have to admit that when it came to deciding to break one of these resolutions I had a few qualms. However, I have no intention, especially now, of breaking the first one.

The actual flight across the ocean was uneventful. We had a short stop in Newfoundland and a very good meal, then late in the afternoon took off for the Irish Coast. A strong wind was following us and far below, through the broken clouds, I could see great heavy rollers moving across the waters. There were no ships in sight but had there been, I, an airman not a sailor, would not have traded my position for theirs. Our trip was smooth, the only real

discomfort being that it was very cold. Our ship was stripped of everything but essentials, but we all managed to sleep most of the way.

On landing in Ireland I went for a short walk through the country lanes to stretch my legs and came across a delightful Irish policeman. I asked him if he had heard any news of what happened in London the night before. "Sure", he said, "They bombed London all night long. There were some people killed but I don't think there was any harm done."

I had undertaken the trip to England to see amongst other things exactly how the civilian population was taking the terrific hammering of the aerial blitzkrieg. Immediately on landing I found just what I had expected—a cheerful, determined attitude in the midst of a vicious and sustained attack. ✓

Driving to London was, after the last war, a strange experience. Now, as then, one saw constant signs of war activity but of course now it is different and at first hard to realize—despatch riders on motorcycles going full speed here and there—convoys of lorries everywhere. It seemed very like the last war but the great difference lay in this fact—that all the activity of which I was witness was not training or practising for war. This was the front line.

Through a beautiful countryside that should be immune from attack, here and there one would see damage done by bombs—in the green fields and the pasture lands, here and there great black patches where an enemy machine had bitten the dust. On the roads one constantly met great trucks with long trailers carrying the remains of crashed German machines.

Throughout the whole of my visit I saw many and repeated raids and discussed the war with dozens and dozens of people whose places had been bombed and often completely destroyed. They were all cheerful. They were all carrying on. They were all anxious to know what we felt about them in Canada. And in their minds as one thought, that confident in the knowledge that full-hearted support

and help was coming from the sister nations, they would hold on with the sternest determination, regardless of whatever hardships and frightfulness might lie ahead. (Applause.)

From the papers and magazines one sees, London appears to be in ruins. That is, of course, very far from being the case. When I left I was informed by most reliable authorities that London was being destroyed at the rate of 4 per cent per annum. That gives her a very long life.

One experience I had, completely describes the attitude of Britain in this hour of danger. I give it to you as I saw it, first-hand.

Driving through the northern suburbs I suddenly heard the crash of bombs in front of me. We arrived in less than half a minute at the crossroads where the first bomb dropped. Already a policeman was diverting the traffic. Already Air Raid Precaution men were picking up debris and actually brushing up the street.

We were diverted to the right—again I saw policemen running here and there, and when the traffic was stopped I decided to get out of my car and walk through the district. It was one of those more or less new London suburbs—nice little houses with sweet little gardens and hedges in front of them. Houses close together and nice wide roads. As I walked down, everywhere, in front of every house, there were groups of people standing by the gateway, all excitedly discussing what had happened. And what had happened was that a bomber had darted out of the clouds and dropped five bombs over this peaceful little district—the last place in the world that could be described as a military objective.

The only damage that appeared to have been done was that windows were shattered over what would be four or five of our city blocks. Anyway, I saw nobody injured, although there must have been a few, but in every case I found these people looking at their own house and then looking at their neighbour's house and laughing good-naturedly about it.

I saw in one case a woman running out of a house carrying a small boy of three or four, and with a broad smile on her face she was calling back to whosever house it was—"Thanks so much for looking after him." That is the spirit that I found everywhere.

Inside another house that I passed, a man was already—although the place had only been bombed three or four minutes before—hitting furiously with a walking stick or umbrella, at the jagged ends of glass left in his window. From across the street a neighbour was chivying him about his blind. He looked up, saw his window blind above him in tatters, tore it down and hurling it through the vacant window, laughed as he shouted back, "There's the bloody thing!"

On my trips through the countryside which I tried first of all by motor car, I saw many things that were amusing in their cheerfulness. Here is a country at war—any section or part of which may be blown to bits at any moment—but yet, on the main roadway, referring of course to their national effort, they put up huge billboard signs saying, "GO TO IT!" Of course, as a result everybody is driving too fast.

Another sign which expresses best of all the pure British humour was, "BE LIKE DAD, KEEP MUM". I also saw in a newspaper the headline—"IF YOUR HOUSE GOES GIVE THE POST OFFICE YOUR NEW ADDRESS". It is going to take a long time to beat a nation that, in a moment when their enemies claim they are beaten to their knees, paint signs like that on their billboards.

When I found it was impossible in the short time available for me to visit as many places as I wanted to by road, I decided with some trepidation to fly in a light machine from one place to another.

This is not quite as simple as it sounds to us here in Canada, because the weather in Britain is misty for the most part and cloudy at the wrong time of the day. Then, too, German machines now have a habit of popping out of the clouds at unexpected places. Sometimes they are

lost—but when they do pop out it doesn't much matter, if you are near them, whether they are lost or not.

Three of us, one day, flew in a small machine around the outskirts of London and near the East Coast of England in its most raid-ridden time, completely unarmed except for a Very pistol which I could not have got out of its socket without taking my shoe off. Trying to negotiate our way so as to avoid the balloon barrages was, without giving any secrets away, like going through the most complicated mine field that one could imagine.

In every paper you pick up you read about the stirring battles in the air that occur over Britain. I saw many of them and could not have been more stirred or more thrilled. Those fighter pilots of ours are superb. Daily, in raid after raid, dozens of enemy planes coming at the same time were shattered and beaten and sent limping home. But what one doesn't hear so much about is the magnificent work that our bombers are doing.

On the coasts of France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark and Norway daily and nightly they hammer the enemy. Far into Germany and as far as Poland these men—boys in years some of them, but men just the same—penetrate, operating, by a navigation system that is an education in itself, to their exact objective, then, finding what weather conditions they may, sometimes spending an hour or more over a spot, they carefully select their objective. We do not, as the Germans are doing, do any indiscriminate bombing; our objectives are all military objectives. (Applause.)

To the men who fly these machines belongs the highest praise. And when I say those men who fly these machines, let me make it very clear that I am not referring to the pilots alone. It seems to me that the day when the pilot got all the credit is most definitely, and rightly, gone. In the old days the pilot's assistant, then known as the observer and now known as members of the aircrew, did not receive the credit due them. Things have changed now. The air observer, the air gunner and the wireless

operator are recognized as being the most important people on that aircraft.

I was once an observer myself and how proud I am that I had that experience. I never see one of our men with an air gunner's or observer's badge on that I do not thrill with pride and think of the days when I was one of the first to wear that badge.

On these great and important flights they are the heroes—they are the men who are fighting your battle and my battle—night by night, through cloud and storm, hundreds and hundreds of miles far into skies torn by blasting shells.

It has occurred to me that a great deal of doubt exists in some people's minds as to the accuracy of the figures published in our official claims of machines shot down and those that we admit lost. It was part of my duty on my visit abroad to find out at first hand how our figures were arrived at. May I here and now give you my word of honour that our claims of figures, our statements of enemy losses, are most definitely conservative. I have seen the physical results and have had the opportunity of studying the methods by which these figures are quoted. On the other hand the statements of our own losses are absolutely accurate.

The German statements are as truthful and sincere as Hitler's promises have been since he came into power. What I feel we do not realize is that already we have won a great victory. The British are masters of understatement. We have already achieved that of which, being British, we will not boast for some months or years to come.

Also the question undoubtedly arises in people's minds—"Are we doing as much damage as we claim by our bombing?" There again I can give you my word. I actually saw photographs of a very famous German battleship—off which our bombers blew the tail. I saw photographs of her in dry dock being repaired, and after being rebuilt, confirmation photographs of bombing which had again damaged her severely. What of course had hap-

pened was this—that the repeat attacks were delayed until the most propitious moment arrived, whereupon again her tail was more than twisted.

Precautions against invasion are beyond belief and finding one's way around England is so difficult it is indescribable. I had the most hopeless afternoon trying to get across country in a motor car from the west of London. At a fork on a main road where I was puzzled, I went into a pub standing beside the road to enquire my way. The proprietor told me that he didn't know which was the right road; he had only been there six weeks and he had not been outside the door. I asked his wife if she knew and she said she did not; also the barman, whom by pure chance I saw. The reply was the same. At last I found my way myself and learned later that those people had been living in that part for forty years.

During my visit over there I was called to Downing Street for a chat with Mr. Churchill, whom I knew very well in less troublesome times. Suffice it to say that I found him exactly as one pictures him when listening to his inspiring broadcasts—strong, fearless and determined—the stern, courageous, unflinching leader of his people—nay more, the leader of all there is left of freedom in the world to-day. (Applause.) Great crises in England have produced great men. The threat of Napoleon gave her Pitt. The menace of Hitlerism gave us Winston Churchill. (Applause.)

I also had the honour of a three-quarter-hour audience with the King and I feel that it was as a compliment to our Service that he received me wearing the uniform of Marshal of the Royal Air Force. Let me say here that every person that I met in England is full of the most profound admiration for both Their Majesties. Their work has been tireless. They are a constant inspiration to their people. The anger at the bombing of Buckingham Palace is tremendous.

My audience with the King was in the same room in which he sat during the last raid on the Palace. He explained to me what happened. A bomb burst first of all

in front of the Palace, then the second one in the Inner Court. Hearing the first, he was looking out the window when the second one burst on the opposite side of the Court to his room. He pointed out to me from the same window the men still repairing the damage that was done.

The people of England have never been so close to each other as they are to-day—all on one level—all working for one purpose. The poorest know that the richest and the highest in the land are being bombed and taking it just as they are. (Applause.) There is no more security in palaces than in humble cottages. All are together in this combat—all in the front line.

Naturally I spent as much time as possible with our Royal Canadian Air Force over there. They have established wonderful reputations. No. 1 Fighter Squadron has been used for some time as a shock troop squadron and they have well deserved that honour. On all hands I heard the highest praise of them. The officers I found in very good spirits, very serious and determined, but optimistic and full of confidence—delighted on all occasions to engage the enemy wherever they could find him.

During some of my days in London, there were heavy raids and with a clear sky I was able to watch a number of fights in the air—much quicker and faster than in my old days but the same tactics, the same manoeuvres, the same dash and verve. A modern fight in the air reminds one rather of a very exciting attack on goal in a fast hockey game—machines darting in and out at incredible speed.

So I have come back having seen the people of this great nation fighting for their very life over their own soil, determined that not one inch of that beloved land shall ever belong to an invader. They are counting on us. They are holding on, knowing that the fullest support in every possible way will come from us to them. To them the picture is one of the Empire on the march. They know that we are with them through and through.

They count on our pilots and aircrews to help them

hold that land and they know that in our schools in Canada, on our spreading air fields, is the spirit of boundless vitality, of unquenchable eagerness not to be left out of the great fight for a great cause.

A quarter of a century ago it was the privilege of many of us to go to Britain to help in a great conflict, to do our humble best towards victory. To-day we are again in the heart of a still greater conflict, and having so recently seen them in action, it is with the most intense admiration, with the most profound pride, that I salute the matchless splendour of our young airmen to-day—who through challenge and combat hold grimly and relentlessly the captaincy of the clouds that roll over Britain. (Applause.)

Twenty-five years ago we had difficult and unequal fighting in the skies but twenty-two years ago we drove the pirate Huns out of the skies of Europe. We did it then and we will do it again.

May I repeat—the Empire is on the march. We are all together, and, as the months roll by, trained pilots and aircrews in their thousands will proceed to the other side to do once again what their forebears did before—blaze the trail of combat and of conquest with Britain—beside her—fighting together until the last Messerschmitt fades away and the sound of Dorniers and Heinkels is no longer heard in the land.

The British Commonwealth Air Training Plan is a great success. It was a great conception that will be a magnificent contribution to ultimate victory. A steady flow of pilots, air observers, wireless operators, air gunners, has already begun its course from Canada to the other side. That stream of reinforcements, all splendidly trained, will increase from week to week.

It is my definite and sincere belief that the results of this Empire Air Training Plan may well prove to be the most vital factor in our victory. There is no question in my mind—Germany will not be able to produce the quality of air personnel capable of meeting, without defeat, such as we will send forth.

Hitler is at last confronted with a force and with a

people that relies upon the staunch spirit of men and women who will fight and die for a just cause; who value their freedom more than anything else. They believe with Pericles that "Happiness is freedom and freedom is courage."

In this hour of Britain's formidable ordeal, there are but two dominant thoughts—succour for the grief-stricken and homeless and punishment for the criminals who have done this thing.

The rôle that once belonged alone to the Mother of our Empire now belongs to all the Empire. The heavy load of responsibility now falls upon the Commonwealth of democratic peoples. The tasks ahead may be hard and heavy—they most definitely will be. To-day the encouragement, the inspiration and the fullest effort of all the Empire must be given without stint to the Mother of us all, "One who never turned her back, but marched breast forward".

They, our kith and kin, are, indeed, veritable sleepless sentinels upon the furthest frontiers of freedom. I say to you with the greatest sincerity, without reservations of any kind, that as a result of what I have seen I am still further convinced that England shall stand—and the Empire will in future, after these times of travail, be a greater, more vital, more decisive factor in world history than it ever has been before. (Prolonged applause.)

MR. R. A. COURTICE (President of the Canadian Club): Mr. Chairman, that stimulating address must give us all added pride and confidence in the English people, in the Royal and the Royal Canadian Air Force and in the ultimate triumph of the cause for which they are fighting.

In addition to the great contribution that the Air Marshal is making to our war effort in the air, he has become a top flight ambassador for the British Empire. When he arrived in England on his recent trip he broadcast a message of good cheer from Canada to the British

Isles. And we know that it was received enthusiastically over there.

In expressing to you, Sir, the sincere thanks of the Empire and the Canadian Clubs for this inspiring address, I do so with the wish that you may have continued health and strength to carry on the great work you are doing for Canada and the Empire. (Applause.)

HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON: Gentlemen: I am not attempting to add a word to what Mr. Courtice has so well said in appreciation of the Air Marshal's address to-day. I would like, however, to point out that we have with us some distinguished guests. We have another man who has come back home—Major-General Constantine. (Applause.) Then, we have our old friend, the Prime Minister of Ontario, who resists all my efforts to keep him in the straight and narrow way and persists in pursuing his own wayward course, but we are delighted to have him here. (Applause.) I can't say that he is coming back home, he may be going back home. I am not expressing any opinion because I am entirely non-partisan. However, we are delighted to have the Prime Minister with us. I am sure you will all agree about that. (Applause.)

"THE INVASION OF NORWAY"

AN ADDRESS BY

CAPTAIN HJALMAR RIISER-LARSEN, R.N.N.

Chairman: The President, The Honourable G. Howard Ferguson.

Thursday, November 14, 1940

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON: I have very great pleasure in presenting to you to-day a gentleman who occupies a very prominent position in our minds at the moment—Captain Riiser-Larsen. He has had a varied career, a remarkable career, the old viking type of career, that carries our memory back to the days when they had the colossal nerve to sail up the River Thames and try to capture London, centuries ago. Captain Riiser-Larsen is not unknown in this locality. He has an encampment of flying men in training on the lake shore here and perhaps it would surprise many of you to know he already has four hundred Norwegians out there in training. Their intense devotion to their country, coupled with their confidence in the leadership of Captain Riiser-Larsen, is bringing daily accretion to the already substantial number he has. I am sure it is a great delight to feel that we have Norway as an ally. (Applause.) Captain Riiser-Larsen came from Oslo, one of the prettiest spots I have ever visited in my life, nestling down at the bottom of a huge fjord, beautifully surrounded, open to the sea, and laying special stress, very naturally, perhaps, upon the training of men for the sea. I recall seeing their Marine Training School, where huge numbers of their husky young Nor-

wegians were enthusiastically taking training to assist in the development of their trade and the protection of their own land. Now, I haven't asked Captain Riiser-Larsen what he will talk about. I have told him to talk about anything he likes, because we will be interested in anything that comes from a man who has had such a continuously adventurous life. Captain Riiser-Larsen. (Applause.)

CAPTAIN HJALMAR RIISER-LARSEN, R.N.N.: Gentlemen: I am exceedingly glad to have this opportunity to speak to so many distinguished gentlemen on this side of the Atlantic, because I want as many as possible of you to hear what actually took place in Norway this spring.

On the 9th of April and the following days, German press agencies sent out a lot of articles all over the globe, telling the people that the Norwegians were rascals and traitors and actually good for nothing. Their intention in doing that was to have the other smaller nations believe that there was nothing for the smaller nations to do but just go down, but these articles were far from correct and I want to tell you how I saw it happen and state a few facts.

In order to make you understand what is going on in Europe to-day and to understand the situation in regard to Germany, one has to take out the Treaty of Versailles and read through it. There are a couple of items in this Treaty which were not at all bad for the Germans and those paragraphs said that Germany had to abandon their Army and their Navy and their Air Force after the last war. But when Hitler came into power they began secretly to start to build up a new Army, a new Air Force and a new Navy. They had nothing whatever to start on. They had no old staff to hamper them, no old ships, no old guns, no old planes, they could start at the base of the technical developments of 1934, forgetting all about what was before that time, and building up these new forces with modern planes and tanks and everything, they saw how these things could be used in war and gradually they invented quite a new war technique. There was not

very much left of the strategy of Napoleon, about which we had to read in army colleges until recently. They saw perfectly well that the Air Force to-day was no auxiliary to the Navy, or an auxiliary to the Army, it was something huge in itself, and of great importance, compared even to the Navy and the Army, and they saw how tanks could be used and should be used, and there was no more marching of soldiers twenty and thirty miles a day with all their equipment. They were all transported by truck and lorry and came to the scene of fighting not fatigued by long marches but ready to go into action.

You know, during the long winter, nothing actually happened to the Maginot Line. During those days the Germans laid plans for what was going to happen in the summer. They included in this plan submission of Norway but they based their plans on the presumption that Norway would not defend itself. They might have had certain reasons to believe that, when they looked upon the Norwegian defence, but the Germans are very bad psychologists and they didn't think about what was inside our hearts. We had a very little Navy which was mobilized in September last year; a very little Air Force, also mobilized; and the Army was not mobilized at all. There were just a few thousand troops in northern Norway, on account of the situation on the Finnish border.

What happened also showed that they believed we would not fight. On the night of the 8th of April they sent ships to attack all the strategic points of the coast. We got warning in the middle of the day on the 8th that a huge column of ships, transports and war-ships had passed the Danish Straits going north. We were alarmed, of course, but not perhaps as much as we should have been because on the 25th of December that very same fleet did the same thing and returned. We believed it to be some kind of manoeuvre. Anyway, to tell you how unprepared Norway, as well as Denmark was, I will tell you a little incident that happened in Copenhagen on the 8th. I happened to be there with my wife. We had attended a meeting when news came about the transport

fleet. I was immediately called to Oslo where I was Chief of the Naval Air Staff. I had to take a plane at three o'clock in the afternoon to get back there. Our Danish friends begged me to let my wife stay back in Copenhagen because they said it looked as though something were going to happen to Norway. They said, "The Germans are going to attack Norway. Why not let your wife be here in Denmark? She will be perfectly safe here." I said, "Why?" They said, "Because we have a non-aggression treaty with Germany." Twenty hours later, Denmark was totally invaded.

Well, I will tell you, as briefly as possible what happened around the coast of Norway. In the Fjord of Oslo there is a very narrow part where we have an old fortress. The Germans sent several big ships with transports up the fjord in the middle of the night. It was a pitch black night, there were low clouds and poor visibility. The patrol boat at the outlet of the fjord was suddenly silent. Nothing was heard from it and another boat was sent out to find what had happened.

The patrol boat had been rammed in the darkness of the night and had not been able to warn the place by radio. The German ships proceeded and came up very close to this fortress and the fortress opened fire on the leading ship, the "Blücher". She was hit by two shots from the 12-inch guns but she proceeded a few hundred yards farther and came abreast of our shore torpedo stations. They dropped two torpedoes into her and that was enough. One of the torpedoes tore open the fuel tank, and the fuel spread all over the water. When the ship turned over and went down the fuel was ignited. There were fourteen hundred men on board the "Blücher" and most of them were burned in the water. There was one thing which didn't make us Norwegians cry the next morning when we heard about it. On board the "Blücher" there were the three hundred Gestapo officers which were to have had control. The three hundred of them went down and none of us wept. There were direct hits on another of the big ships and they all turned around and retreated but sent

the people ashore and turned out the fjord, on both sides of it. Their plans had been that these ships should have passed the fortress without being shot at and go directly to Oslo, send the troops ashore, surround the place and take the King and Government prisoners—and then dictate the peace terms.

By this incident the King and the Government got time to get away from Norway into the north end of the country. At Kristiansand, on the southern part of the coast, they sent a cable to the garrison at the fortress, in Norwegian, saying that three French war-ships had permission to enter the port. Three war-ships came under the French flag and were permitted to enter the port. The Commander there believed they were French ships that were coming to our help and assistance. When they had got inside the range of the guns at the fortress they pulled down the French flag and hoisted the swastika instead. A small Norwegian patrol boat sank one of the ships. At Stavanger a small Norwegian torpedo boat sank a big German transport before it was hit itself and blown up.

At Bergen several instances of fighting happened during the first night and during the first days after the night of April the 9th. I know that one of the naval aircraft sank a German mine layer.

In the Fjord of Trondhjem, which is quite a long fjord in the middle of the country on the west coast, the Germans got hold of all the Norwegian coast steamers they could lay their hands on during the night and lined them up along the sides of their ships, so that when they steamed past the fortress our gunners dared not shoot because they would hit Norwegians. Many would say they should have shot. I just want to remind you that Norway has had no war since 1814. For one hundred and twenty-six years no Norwegian soldier has lifted a gun to shoot another man.

At Narvik we had two old coast defence battle-ships of forty-two hundred tons. One was lying outside the port and one just at the entrance, when in the middle of the night German destroyers hove in sight—this is another

trick of the German way of fighting. They sent an officer with a white flag in a boat to the Norwegian ship. The officer went on board and asked to see the Norwegian Commanding Officer and requested him to surrender. His answer was that "Our orders are to fight and go down." That is the standing order for the whole of the Navy. Well, nothing could be done and this German officer went down into his boat; but instead of going directly back to his ship—and the Norwegian ships couldn't open fire before this man got on board his own ship again—he went a few yards ahead with his motor launch and then fired a Very pistol, with a brilliant light and gave full speed, which gave the torpedo aimers on the destroyers a chance to aim their torpedoes, and the Norwegian ship was ten seconds later hit by one of the destroyer's torpedoes. In one minute the munitions magazine and the ship were blown in the air and only five or six men were saved. The second Norwegian battle-ship opened fire immediately following this attack and damaged, very badly, one of the destroyers and also damaged the second one before she was hit herself by two torpedoes. The first destroyer sank the next day. Two hundred and ninety-six good Norwegian sailors and officers went down. That is what happened around the coast in the middle of the night. I should have liked very much to have had a chance to stand behind some curtains in Hitler's room around three o'clock in the morning when it was reported to him that the Norwegians were fighting, because then he got panic-stricken.

He has spoken quite a lot about a secret weapon and we have all been wondering what that weapon is. He has said several times that England is no longer an island. When he said that, we thought of the possibility of bombing England from the air. England was not invulnerable any longer. Now, he showed what his secret weapon was and what he meant by the statement that England is no longer an island. It was the mass invasion by air. He had sent far too few troops to Norway to be able to take Norway when we fought. He had to make sure of it. He

couldn't lose prestige by having the German troops thrown into the water again so he used the new weapon, the mass invasion by air. I had a chance to see it on the 9th and the following days. About seven o'clock in the morning the reconnaissance planes came and a lot of air fighting took place with the Norwegian single seaters, and at ten o'clock huge waves of transport planes came. Each plane had twenty-six very well equipped soldiers on board. They landed just on the outside of Oslo and fought down the small defence we had there. They lost fourteen or fifteen planes that day. That didn't matter to the Germans. It doesn't matter to the Germans if they do lose planes because if they have decided to take a country they have counted—well, it will cost ten thousand planes to take it, and they take the country, and the ten thousand planes go. They just waste material and men—they can always get more.

Well, I was at Oslo watching this and it gradually dawned upon me that this was something new. We knew, of course, that a few hundred men could be transported by planes, but tens of thousands of men with machine-guns, with bicycles and all kinds of equipment! We never thought they could do it to that extent. At Bergen, for instance, where there is no land airport they transported a whole regiment of three thousand men, with their outfits by seaplane and they landed at Bergen in a small harbour in three hours.

Well, on the land, the Norwegians had not mobilized, as I said, but the young boys sneaked out of Oslo, through the woods and through the German lines with their skis and packsacks, and gathered into platoons where they met other boys, and the platoons gathered into companies and battalions. They procured officers and made what resistance they could until the people came down from the valleys. When this fighting took place the Germans understood at once that they had to get hold of the King. There is another thing they did which a decent mind could not conceive of. A diplomat is not supposed to take part in actual fighting, but the German Air Attaché was in Oslo

and he got hold of the first German soldiers that came there. They took town busses and rushed after the King. Fortunately, the Norwegians had got some troops together, one hundred men or something like that, who made a stand against them just outside of the place where the King was, and the first man to fall was this German Attaché. They didn't get the King. From then on they were after him the whole time, trying to kill him when they couldn't get him alive. They sent out the German Minister in Oslo and he asked to have an interview with the King. They didn't know where he was. The King gave that interview because he would try everything to stop this bloodshed. Well, in that way the German Minister found out where the King was. The King rejected his proposals and the Minister went directly back to Oslo. One hour after he got there German planes, in big waves, came over the place where the King was. They bombed the whole vicinity, and on one occasion he had to throw himself into a ditch to escape. He finally got into the woods, and for one hour and twenty minutes they bombed and machine-gunned him continuously. Finally, they had no more bombs and munitions left and they departed, but on every occasion they could get at him they tried to kill him. They hoped this would stop the war.

We made the resistance we could on land, and I will tell you a few things about how the Germans were fighting—the new ways they have of fighting, ways which never a decent mind could conceive of, and consequently no decent mind could find precautions against.

After the last war, during the long blockade, Norwegians took German boys to Oslo and throughout the whole of the country, and kept them for half a year. They took them up the next year and had more for another half a year or a year, just feeding them—thousands and thousands of young boys. They learned, of course, to speak Norwegian, because children easily learn languages. Well, all of these former boys now came visiting Norway as officers, speaking fluent Norwegian. They could go to broadcasting stations and

so on, and the Norwegians couldn't tell that it was Germans that had taken over the stations. And they did worse than that. During the first days they dressed the German soldiers up as Norwegians. They then went out into the country and burned down the farm homes, and when the Norwegians did come, they, of course, were shot at too, because the farmer's didn't know who were Norwegians and who were Germans. They machine-gunned the streets, as they are doing now in England. They bombed hospitals and hospital ships so that the Chief of Medical Services had to issue an order that the Red Cross should not be flown anywhere because they would go for that first. They even machine-gunned funeral processions, every living thing they saw on the road they shot at. They bombed lonely houses in the mountains that were no military object whatever, just with the object of terrorizing the people in an attempt to make us give up fighting.

In most of the small towns of Norway the houses are built of wood—because, of course, we have plenty of it. They would set fire to these small houses with the incendiary bombs and they kept the firemen away from putting out the fires by machine-gun fire. Most of the towns were burned down and are now left in ruins. I received, some time ago, the statistics which showed that fifteen thousand homes in Norway had been destroyed, and if you take everything into consideration, the public buildings and so on, it will take us two generations to build again and to get as far as we were on the 9th of April.

When the fighting in Norway had to be given up the King and the Government went to London and at the first meeting they had there they decided to go on fighting. You may ask how can a country which is completely invaded from land's end to land's end go on fighting? Where do they get their money? Well, Norway was one of the biggest shipping nations in the world and five-sixths of our merchant marine was outside of Norway, sailing the seven seas, which they are still doing. That gives us money for our war effort.

The best part of the war effort is, of course, this great

shipping fleet which is manned by thirty thousand sailors, bringing munitions and guns and bringing food also, to the colonies. (Applause.) Apart from that we have two Air Forces here in Toronto; that is the Army Air Force and the Navy Air Force, which we are reorganizing here. The Chairman told you that we have five hundred men and officers to-day and that is increasing gradually. The nucleus of this crew here are people who have been fighting in Norway, in the Air Forces, and who have escaped. We have here a lot of fliers who flew their own planes to England when they had to give up fighting. From Norway they flew to the Shetland Islands, which is a long distance to fly. They stole German planes and flew over to England. They came over in fishing boats and small sailing boats. I have two men who bought a small rowing boat for five dollars up in the northern part of the country. They rowed down the coast to the western part and rowed across the North Sea. It took them five days and nights to row the North Sea. I asked one of them when they came over here, "What about sleep in a little boat rocking about?" He said, "O, no, Sir, we didn't think of sleeping, it was much too cold to sleep. We had to row in order to keep warm."

Three days ago a young Norwegian arrived here who got out of the country as late as October the 6th. They tell me that all over the country they know that we have a training camp here in Toronto, and all the young lads are speaking about nothing else but how to get out of the country and get to Canada.

And further, as to our war effort—at the time the British Navy was short of hands, nine hundred Norwegian sailors, being in England, joined up with the British Navy where they now are fighting, and we have quite a big Army Legion training in Scotland where they have already done some useful work.

What I was going to say about this secret weapon of Hitler's was that that problem of mass invasion from the air opened the eyes of everybody when they saw what had happened in Norway and also what happened in the

Low Countries. This gave England a chance to take the precautions necessary to stop German planes from landing. Such precautions were not taken at an earlier date and it gave England all the necessary time to equip and drill their Home Guards. That was during the nine weeks of fighting in Norway.

The programme of Hitler was completely upset. Now he saw that he could not invade from the air. He knew, I suppose, that it would be pretty hard to do it from the sea, so he switched over his plan and got all these parties gathered together in the Channel ports. But he didn't reckon with the Royal Air Force which he never has reckoned with in this war. They have, however, shown him what they are—the most magnificent corps that ever was fighting for its country in the history of the globe. (Applause.)

It was written in the English papers and many other papers, when the Germans went into Norway—you know the background of the long winter without any fighting—it was written that the war was going to be won in Norway. That didn't come true, but it is partly true anyway, because the Germans *lost* the war in Norway, and because the cost was so expensive to them, too. It cost sixty-five thousand men to take Norway. It is now a question of finishing it and that question is also a humanitarian question, to a very large extent, because the sooner it can be finished the better for all the people in the occupied countries. They will have to suffer quite a lot, so it mustn't last too long, and therefore one must not slacken on this war effort but go on.

And now, looking at everything that has happened around us we see that even the Germans begin to understand that it is going wrong. Look at Hitler. Before, he used to sit in Berlin, calling the big people to come to see him there or see him at Berchtesgaden. He seems to be rather nervous now. He went to Paris to see Laval. He went to the Spanish border to see Franco, to try to get him into the war. I don't think he will succeed because Spain sees now who is going to win. He used to go down to the

Pass to meet Mussolini. He was so eager to see him the last time that he went to Florence and very soon he might go to Rome, but Rome is going to be a very unhealthy place in the coming days. So I think we can look forward with complete confidence, knowing that England is growing tremendously in strength from day to day, knowing that there will come what we call in Norway, a spring cleaning, when they clean up the houses in the spring, and there will be quite a cleaning up all over.

I say again, I am glad to have had this opportunity, and we Norwegians are all very glad to be on your side, of course. Mind you, we are very few but this war machine is quite a big machine, and there are small cog wheels, too. Norway is a tiny little cog wheel in this machinery, but we are going to make a good cog wheel, doing our part of the job.

Before concluding, as this is being broadcast, I want to say a few words, not to you, but to the person who is sitting not very far from here, a German who is taking down this speech of mine in shorthand. I know you are going to send it to the States and from the States it will be sent to Berlin, and from Berlin probably a copy will be sent to Oslo. I send this warning to the German soldiers in Norway. They don't know that they are going to lose the war, but even if they don't think they are, they must deal kindly with the population in Norway and also in all the occupied countries, because the day is not distant when we are going to check up your account, and it would be very well if some Norwegians would recommend your pardon. Thank you.

Concluding, I want to say a few words, not as a Naval Officer, but just as a human citizen of this globe. I am very sorry for what happened to France but there is some good in it. Always in my life, when something has happened which I haven't liked I have taken the medal and turned it, and the medal has always two sides, you know, and one often finds on the reverse side good things. This thing with France is, on the reverse, also in some respects a good thing, for when this war finishes I sincerely hope

that there is only one big power that is going to settle the peace terms, and that is England. (Applause.) I hope there will be no Treaty Conference in Versailles, with a lot of countries discussing and finally just drafting something which is a compromise which will make us lose the peace.

There is another thing I want to ask of you, and that is, for Heaven's sake, don't make a League of Nations any more. That was shown to be a failure. It has got to be a failure. You can't get all races and nations together in a huge room discussing such matters, where nationalism and chauvinism are the leading factors. You cannot get them to agree where you set up such a thing as that. It is quite unnecessary, it hasn't been of any good and it will never be of any good because it can't work. There is something much nearer at hand. Great Britain has policed this world for hundreds and hundreds of years, and we in the small countries have been perfectly happy about things. It seems now that the world perhaps has grown a bit too big for one country to police, through the population increasing and through communications being improved everywhere, but why couldn't all the English-speaking people, the United States together with Great Britain, form a police union. If you two big nations would do that, undertake to police the world, I know that we small countries will be only too happy and too glad, because we know we would live in peace and we would be perfectly happy with the rock of freedom, the Gibraltar of Freedom which England is to-day. (Applause—prolonged.)

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON: I will ask Dr. McArthur to express our appreciation.

THE HONOURABLE DUNCAN McARTHUR: Mr. President, Gentlemen: I am sure that we are all extremely grateful to Captain Larsen for the most vivid description which he has brought to us of what happened in Norway in the middle of this year. Many of us had suspected that resort was made to the utmost means of treachery, but I

am doubtful if we realized the extent to which treachery was resorted to in taking advantage of the Norwegian people. It is possible, Mr. President, that we are welcoming to-day a descendant of one of the first of the Europeans who set foot on Canadian soil. In these days when we welcome the valour and bravery and courage of the Norwegian people, we would like to think that they had something to do with the founding of European settlement on the North American continent. We are grateful to him, not only for his address and for his words of encouragement, we are grateful to him for the magnificent work which he is doing to assist our effort in the persecution of the war.

On your behalf, I wish to thank him and to express the hope that before many months may pass, the King and Government of Norway may be restored to their ancient capital and that Norway once again may know the ways of peace. (Applause.)

“CLOSE TO THE WAR”

AN ADDRESS BY

PERCY JAMES PHILIP.

Chairman: The President, The Honourable G. Howard Ferguson.

Thursday, November 21, 1940

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON: Gentlemen: We are very fortunate in the guest-speaker that has been good enough to come to us to-day. He had an excellent start in life. He was born of Scottish parents and having the usual Scottish curiosity, he has been poking his nose into every country of the world almost and enquiring about everybody else's business.

Mr. Philip has had quite a remarkable career. I don't propose to take any time going over it. He belongs to the Fourth Estate, that powerful section of the public that is the only dictatorial, totalitarian organization in the world—the press of the country. They mould public opinion, they say. I rather think they hammer it into shape, rather than mould it. They create trends of thought and influence governments, direct policies and I suppose before very long they will be taking over the pulpit. However, it is a great pleasure, I am sure, to introduce our good friend, Mr. Percy Philip, who at Ottawa, represents the *New York Times*, that well and widely known journal that has always been so friendly toward this country. (Applause.)

MR. PERCY JAMES PHILIP: I thank you for your particularly characteristic introduction. I never heard

myself better described—born in Scotland, behaving as such, poking my nose into other people's business ever since. I used to say I had the largest vital space of any man. I was born in Scotland, lived for twenty-four years in France and worked for twenty years for an American newspaper owned by Jews. And now I have been sent to Ottawa for a rest. I assure you, Sir, I shall not poke my nose too much into Canadian affairs. I am more interested at the moment and only interested, in the war, and what I want to do in Ottawa is quietly try to get people over on this side to realize what that war is. That is why I gave the title to what I am going to tell you, "Close to the War", because for the last fifteen months that I stayed in France, I was constantly close to the war, and then the war began coming too close to me.

I want to begin my talk with the flat statement that I am sure we can win this war. (Applause.) Having said that, however, I feel that I must add quickly that from what I have seen and know, it is going to be a long, grim business. Nobody should take it for granted that we will win this war. I know that Mr. Winston Churchill does not and he ought to know. Just because it is different from the last war does not mean at all that it is going to be easier. It is really much more difficult. It is terribly grim now for nearly all the people in Europe, for all those people who have lost the war already and who are in the Nazi grip—their pride broken, their businesses ruined, their families scattered, many in prison, their hopes gone, and themselves near starvation and living in fear. It is grim enough in England, in London, Coventry, Birmingham, and all these other stricken towns where night after night the strain continues of having to live and work and pay taxes and try to sleep to the wailing of the air-raid sirens and the beat and bark of the barrage and the scream and thud of falling bombs crashing through homes and hospitals and churches and cinemas and sometimes factories. I had a little of that—very little by comparison—and I assure you it isn't funny. When these planes come diving at you at five hundred miles an hour with a siren-like ap-

paratus attached, and you wait through the eternity of a split second to know if you are still alive or if the bomb dropped wide, it tears the heart out and ties the nerves in little knots.

"You get used to it," people write me from England. I doubt if I ever would and I know from experience that I would never get used to losing my sleep night after night. Let us pay tribute to those people in England (applause) who are in the front line—chins up, undismayed. The odd thing about them is they are unheroic. The other day I read in some newspaper a letter from someone in London describing how he had been waiting at a corner for a bus with a little crowd of people. An alarm sounded but nobody paid much attention. They went on reading the evening paper. They heard the whistling scream of a dropping bomb. "That one's coming near us," said somebody and they all lay down flat on the ground. There was a crashing explosion a few blocks away, then another, then silence. Everybody got up, dusted his clothes and went on waiting for the bus. They knew that just around the corner people had been killed—but it was their job to take it and carry on. People who behave like that deserve to win.

Here is a letter from my brother who lives on a kind of island on the east coast of England—a little flat island about six miles long and half a mile broad. He said: "The news is nothing much. Since the Blitz started we have had about twenty-five high explosive bombs and about fifty incendiaries on the island, to say nothing of the major portion of an enemy bomber. The total damage has been very slight. I only hope the Hun will keep up that standard of inaccuracy. The nights are a bit noisy as we are on the route to and from London and we have moved our beds down to the living-room where they look a bit odd alongside the piano. We have seen a few battles overhead and two enemy machines brought down which gave us much joy. For recreation we still have nine holes of the golf course." Although he is the age of sixty, an Air Raid Precaution warden, and he goes out on duty when

high explosives and incendiaries fall, he doesn't mention it except in this way: "We put out a few incendiaries which fell in the village last week." And he has the impertinence to say "The news is nothing much."

Gentlemen, that casual manner of the British which, in time of peace, earnest people like the Germans and the French find so irritating, is perhaps our greatest asset now. It is a deceptive mannerism.

The other day I was reading a book by Captain René de Chambrun, who is M. Laval's son-in-law, but otherwise quite a nice fellow. In it he tells how on the 18th of May he was told by his General to go into Arras, which some of you will remember, and see what was happening. From somewhere outside he could see quite well what was happening. The town was evacuated and a handful of British troops was holding it. The Germans were pushing a strong attack from the southeast and de Chambrun felt that he had enough information to satisfy his General. But the English Colonel, who was with him said, "Oh, let's go down into the town, just for the fun of it." Getting in wasn't so bad, de Chambrun writes, but when they got in they were kept listening to two rival tellers of Scotch stories until the Officer in Command said, "If you fellows want to get back you'll have to run for it." They did have to run for it amid a hail of bombs and shells. "I am still wondering," de Chambrun wrote, "what that Englishman meant by going into the town 'for the fun of it'."

It is that spirit which brings us bobbing back. It is the spirit of the men of the "Rawalpindi" and the "Jervis Bay", and of those boys with their Spitfires and their Hurricanes who have held the air in the daylight and will yet succeed in holding it by night. But here I am going to say one word to you: If this night bombing of industrial areas in England goes on at the present rate, you fellows over here will have to put your backs into production in a fashion that you don't yet realize. (Applause.)

Herr Hitler has announced that he is the toughest leader the world has ever known. It is probably true.

Alexander, Julius and all the other Caesars, and many of them were queer customers, Tamerlane, Genghis Kahn, the Normans, Napoleon—none of them were as tough, as inhuman, as maniacal as this recluse of Berchtesgaden who ordered his old companion, Rohm, to shoot himself, who has kept Schuschnigg in prison, who has broken every word he ever gave to anybody and glories in it. His is the toughness of the deformed—the vitally deformed. And he is surrounded by tough men—Goering, Himmler, Hess, Goebbels and all the rest of the Nazi bandits. He is followed by tough men—these young soldiers who used to slip barefoot across the snow last winter up to an outpost of the Maginot Line in the hope of catching an unwary French prisoner, these dive bombers and tank crews who hammered the French Army to pieces in Belgium and came back at us again and again in Dunkerque, who fought it out day after day over the Channel with our lads and didn't give up even although they were shot down in hundreds, who come back night after night over England. They are tough—terribly tough. They are worth fighting and beating.

But I am going to let you into a secret. They are not all tough. There is a weak strain in the rank and file. Some of you remember how stubbornly they fought their machine-guns in the last war, but how they whined "Kamerad" and grovelled when you got at them. This Nazi Army, I believe, and I have been told by very good authorities, is not as tough en masse as the old Imperial Army. French people and Americans who have watched it in the occupied parts of France tell me that these troops of Hitler's tough men are not really as tough as he would like them to be. They sing mechanically and get drunk wistfully. They went swimming last summer down at Biarritz and Saint Jean-de-Luz in batches, as if they were on parade. Every man took off his tunic, every man took off his trousers, all in the same action. They went in swimming, not joyfully at all, but automatically. One young German soldier said to a friend of mine as they

talked about the invasion of England, "You are beaten, but we are sunk. There is no hope for us."

There you have the weak streak—the weak streak in a subject people. But we Britishers, Canadians, Australians, Afrikanders and New Zealanders are tough all through, from Winston Churchill down to the little Cockney children who brag to each other that the bomb that fell in their street was the biggest ever. We are tough all through, resilient and good-humoured because we are in this war of our own sweet choice and not because of anybody's fanatical lust for power and vital space. The whole world is our vital space—especially for a Scotsman. We made it. You here in Canada more than any others have hewn it for yourselves out of the forests and the wilderness, and I know you aren't going to let anybody take it from you or tell you how you are to run it. (Applause.) There is still vital space here and in Australia and Africa, for decent people who come peacefully. There is none for brigands.

Gentlemen, it still remains that Hitler & Company are tough. They have spread their conquest from the Arctic Circle to the Pyrenees and they are pushing down into the Balkans, which their little boy satellite, Mussolini, adds his nuisance value in the Mediterranean. Nevertheless, tough as these people in London are, tough as we all are, we have a tremendous job on our hands if we are going to dislodge them and free these peoples already conquered. The Germans keep pounding at London, at the heart of the Empire, and now the industrial Midlands, knowing if the heart gives way, the limbs—I mean you—will lose their strength. Have you ever seen two boxers in the ring, one of them pounding again and again at the other's heart? That is what is happening in the bombardment of England. But the heart has held out and now the limbs are growing stronger.

Still, we haven't won—remember that. Are we going to win? It is going to take everything every one of us has got. As you know, I have been living in France ever since the last war and spent last winter and this summer

there. I saw what Hitler's blitzkrieg can be really like—what we and you may have to face one of these days. It began on the morning of May 10th when he invaded Holland and Belgium despite all his promises. I was in Nancy and during the early part of the night we had the usual air-raid alarms. Then, just before dawn I heard things coming down as well as going up. They were coming down hard and I could see some fair-sized fires on the other side of the railroad station where the air field was. Later, I found that seventeen French aeroplanes had been destroyed on the field before they got into the air. There were nineteen at Toul and twenty-three near Châlons-sur-Marne. In all, the Germans claim and the French admit, that nearly three hundred aeroplanes were destroyed on the ground that night.

Four days later I was in Belgium, trying to get to the front, but I found that the front was coming to me with a speed that was remarkable. Gentlemen, people criticize the French and Belgian armies for cracking under the strain of that attack. You fellows who were at Vimy, in the Somme, in the Ypres Salient and elsewhere, know something of what the Germans can do in the way of war. Believe me, all that was nothing to the attack along the Meuse last May. It was an avalanche. It poured down from the air and along the ground, mass after mass of exploding steel. Of course the French and the Belgians and our fellows weren't ready for it. We didn't have anything like the number of aeroplanes and tanks we should have had. We hadn't been preparing for war of that sort and it is no good saying we should have been. Let us cut out the criticism and get on with what is ahead of us still. (Applause.) That joint plane and tank attack was something that I don't believe could have been stopped even by the Maginot Line. Its velocity was tremendous.

That army of Hitler's hasn't been beaten. It is still there, as numerous, as well equipped and as well organized as ever. We are holding, but we have still got to beat it.

There is only one thing we can be proud of: the decision of the British Government and the two Commanders to take the army out of Dunkerque, and the way in which that was done. (Applause.) And there let us be fair. We should make a bow to the French Army, who held very well, and many of whom died on the right, covering us; and to the French Navy, which at that time helped us—make no mistake—in the evacuation. I don't believe any other people except the British would have tried to save and could have saved that Expeditionary Force. I know the French didn't think it could be done. The Germans thought they had us cornered and sunk. That was for us, we will probably find later, the turning point of the war. It was in a sense the first Battle of the Marne—the first check to the enemy, but now we are in for that long war we had between 1915 and 1918, that long war of the trenches, with the Channel for our Churchill Line. It is tough, but we have got to depend on the English people to keep on taking it.

Now, what of France: It was their Army and the Belgian right wing which had to take the brunt of the attack, and on May 16th, a French Colonel at Valenciennes told me that the battle was over. "One Army has been completely wiped out," he said, "We shall have to begin over again." The Germans never gave them time. Again I say, you have got to give Jerry his due. He is worth fighting. He is going to be worth beating. And don't think the French and Belgian soldiers didn't fight. They were swamped, overwhelmed by this mechanized monster. I doubt if any troops or any defence system could have withstood that initial impact of Hitler's war machine.

We kept hoping that General Weygand, who had succeeded General Gamelin, would be able to stand on the Somme and on the Aisne, and if these failed, on the Loire. But he could not get his troops moved fast enough. For eight months the French Army had been moving along certain grooves and it could not be suddenly switched from being a static defence force into mobile columns. The French were in a sense the prisoners of a formula

which at the time had turned out to be the wrong formula. Also, and this is very important, the Germans had immense superiority in the air and bombed day and night, from dawn to dusk, and sometimes at night, every railway junction, every important crossroad, every bridge and viaduct between the French Armies in the north and the great mass of men in the Maginot Line and in reserve in the south. They kept thrusting forward deeper and deeper behind these dreadful moving columns of refugees, and by the beginning of June we all knew that in so far as France was concerned the war was over.

I just want to make a little reference to that bombing, the systematic way in which it was done. It was the 17th of June. I had spent the night at Cambrai, which many of you will remember. I will tell you a little anecdote about that. Just as I was leaving, a woman said "Do you think we should leave?" I said, "Well, you will know by to-morrow." She said, "You know, my mother and I didn't leave during the last war. I was just a baby. We stayed over here and we were quite all right. The Canadians used to shell and all the shells fell on that boulevard over there and they always missed the railway station."

Well, the Germans didn't miss the railway station that morning. I put my kit in the railway station, with my typewriter and other things, thinking I would take a train. I was with Taylor Henry, of the Associated Press, and we decided it didn't look as though there would be any train that morning. We went in to town and bought a couple of bicycles. Just as we got back to the station—we weren't further than the length of this room from it—we heard a fellow come on the station and—one, two, three—he was just dropping bombs like that. It wasn't a nice moment. We lay down quickly, of course. He just cleaned that station up and all day long, as we cycled back, we could see everything else going up in fire.

I may tell you, too, that the last sight I had of your monument on Vimy Ridge, was as I came on along the road from Cambrai to Amiens. I could see it gleaming white, standing high on the right-hand side. Gentlemen, I

was glad to hear later that the Germans said it had not been hurt, has not been destroyed in any way. It is still standing there and you will remember the land on which it stands belongs to Canada. I know that none of you fellows will want that to remain permanently within enemy occupation. (Applause.) That monument will be dedicated again with new glory and new honour.

Now, we come to a very controversial matter—the Vichy Government. Ever since I came over here, I have found a tendency to ascribe the French defeat to fifth column work and treachery. It is a long, controversial matter. A lot of French people didn't have their mind and hearts in the war, that is true. They were all worried about how to improve their own country, but militarily, they were absolutely licked in May and June, and during the confusion, with all those people evacuating the north and the towns and the cities, a few men seized the Government and made an armistice with the Germans because they believed that we would be licked too. That was their vital mistake. They predicted their whole position on the fact that within a week or two we would be defeated and it was much better that they should in the moment of panic make a peace with the Germans. But we haven't weakened, we are still fighting, (applause) and we are going on fighting. That has made an enormous difference in France. They know now in France that their only hope is that we shall go on fighting and that we shall win.

The last Frenchman with whom I talked in France when I left in September was an Alsatian, at the Spanish frontier. He was right on the opposite side of the country from his home. He hadn't had any news of his wife and children for five months. They were still in Alsace, and he was getting no letters or word of any kind. He knew the Germans were turning people out of Alsace, as they are now turning them out of Lorraine. There was just nothing he could do about it. Once he found I was English he kept saying, "But the war isn't over yet. I know you English will hold and we will fight again. We aren't finished yet."

That was only one man, but during those two and a half months, or nearly three months that I stayed in France after the armistice, I found that spirit all the time, everywhere, among the common people. There is no thought in my mind that the French will ever co-operate with the Germans in fighting us. It just isn't possible. (Applause.) That spirit of revolt against the Germans is getting stronger than ever.

The Vichy Government is made up of two men—Marshal Pétain and M. Pierre Laval. The old Marshal was persuaded at Bordeaux to vote against continuing the war and to seek an armistice, by Laval and those others that believed that, with France beaten, we couldn't win, and they would be able to obtain honourable terms from the Nazis. The man who persuaded the Marshal was Pierre Laval. Now, Pierre Laval seems to have been wrong. We haven't been beaten and we are not going to be beaten, and France has not got honourable terms from Germany. Her people are held in an iron grip. They cannot send a letter, or cross from one part of the country to another. They have no work, little food, little liberty and no hope. From Lorraine, as from Alsace, they are being expelled in trainloads to make room for Hitler's Germans—thrown out with a suitcase and thirty dollars of all their possessions. Their rich farms, factories, their shops and their homes are confiscated.

Hitler hasn't kept his word with the French and they know it. Then he had the impertinence to suggest recently that he would release some of the eighteen hundred thousand French prisoners he holds, if the Vichy Government would hand over some ports and air fields from which he could attack England and would collaborate in making a free peace. Laval was ready to accept. That man would sacrifice the last shred of his own and his country's honour and independence to satisfy his hatred of the British and his cockeyed belief in himself as a great statesman. But the Marshal wouldn't accept. He knows now that his countrymen have recovered from their panic fear of last June, that the British bulldog won't let go, that the Nazis

are not to be trusted, and that both the tide of popular feeling in France, and of the war, has begun to turn. Laval's friend, Mussolini, has had a most unfortunate time in Greece. Hitler has had to go out of his way again to make a new compact with his former enemies, the Communists.

These are signs that there is a weakness, that there is not a complete mastery of the situation on the side of the Axis. The Marshal is an upright man. He admitted the other day in a broadcast that he has a rope round his neck. He has to submit to the conditions under which he signed the armistice. But he has shown added strength in the last weeks and he is not admitting that the Germans shall go one hair's breadth beyond the terms of the armistice. For an old man of eighty-four to take up that position strongly, is, to my mind, extremely encouraging. At the same time, he has to conform to public demand for a clean-up in France. I am not going to go into the past but all of you remember that there was much need of it. He has, at the same time he is resisting the Germans, to try to build up a new state and a new conception of decency and integrity in public life, but in doing that he is also working to help his countrymen avoid compromise with the Germans or ever doing anything which will dishonour again the name of France.

You will say—but what about Dakar? My answer is the same. The great majority of the French people would rather we had taken Dakar and raised all North Africa to fight on our side. The attempt was made either too soon or too late—I think, myself, too soon. There are all kinds of intricate questions of personal and professional jealousy, of *amour propre* and pride involved. We British are always believers in letting things evolve slowly, in allowing for natural growth. That has been the secret of our success. It seemed to be the wise thing not to be too precipitate in our dealings with the French in Africa. It is an extremely complicated situation at the moment.

Everybody is asking, "What is Weygand going to do?"

What is Weygand doing?" Weygand is a soldier, primarily a soldier. Like all soldiers, all except the political soldiers, he did not like the way things were being done in France and he was immediately accused of being Nazi and Fascist. That wasn't true. He just wasn't in agreement with his Government. And at the last moment he was suddenly thrown into fighting this most tremendous battle of all history, the Battle of France, which was already lost. He is an old man, a man with a great reputation, but I am certain that General Weygand is not, if he can possibly help it, going to go down to his grave leaving behind him only the memory that he was beaten in that tremendous battle. If he can win another battle he is going to do it, and the only chance to do it is with us in Africa. But he is a cautious man, he will take his time, and I think, as I say, as long as we are holding, as long as we can push Mussolini up and down, we don't want to hurry the French. We will let that situation develop. There was much provocation at the time but everything, it seems to me, points to the certainty that the French are with us and the French will rally again to us as soon as they can see the chance.

I noticed in one of the newspapers the other day, a story by one of my friends in Vichy, that when Marshal Pétain went to the Cathedral at Clermont-Ferrand, two German soldiers tried to take a photograph of him. One finds German soldiers all over the place, even in the unoccupied zone. Immediately the French crowd showed its disapproval by beginning to sing the Marseillaise. Nobody had sung it since the defeat and the capitulation. That little story was to me a clear indication of how sentiment is moving. It confirms all that I saw and heard during the three months I spent in France after the armistice was signed—that the French may have been overwhelmed but they aren't beaten. They were compelled to lay down their arms but they are not conquered.

And we are going to need them. Don't let us ever forget that. We may be able to resist the German onslaught but we shall never win the war without the

sympathy of these invaded peoples, without the possibility of their ultimate revolt. The Dutch and Belgian colonies are giving us their aid. There are Czechs, Poles, Danes, Norwegians, Dutch, Belgians and Frenchmen in our armies. That is the way we beat Napoleon—not ourselves alone, but by drawing to us all the people who together hate tyranny and want freedom.

I read how on Armistice Day there was an air-raid alarm in Paris. The Royal Air Force had flown over and dropped flowers on the Arc de Triomphe and the grave of the Unknown Soldier. Gentlemen, that is the right kind of propaganda. That goes straight to the hearts of the millions of French people who are with us—who respect the Marshal, still have confidence in General Weygand, loathe the Nazis and despise Laval.

But there is still a long hard road in front of us until we are able to get rid of this nightmare in which we are all living and restore decency and freedom. We are going to have many heartbreaks and sorrows. We are going to have to be very patient. When you feel impatient over here I want you to think of those other peoples who have already lost the war—of those Poles and Danes and Dutch people, the Belgians, Norwegians and French, all decent people, who are living, starving and still resisting under the heel of the Nazi oppressor. For them, all that makes life pleasant is gone. We may have to pay heavy taxes. We may have to work long hours and know the anguish of having those dear to us in the front line on the land, on the sea and in the air. But when we think of those other people who day and night are tormented by the presence of the enemy—you know we have never known occupation, we Anglo-Saxons; the Scots have, but it is a long time ago and we have retaliated—what we have to put up with seems like nothing. Let us thank God daily that we are still free and can go on working and fighting to stay free from that dreadful Nazi domination which has filled Europe with sorrow and suffering.

I think of people like my own cook, a grand old Frenchwoman. She went back, when we finally left, to

her own little village, occupied by Germans. I know that woman is living every day, wanting to strangle every German she sees, and that goes for the immense majority of the French people, but they had to take it.

If we are going to win we have got to fight. It is the rule of life. There isn't anything worth having that we didn't have to fight for, and we have got to fight hard. The other evening I was listening to a speech on the radio. I tuned in in the middle, and though I didn't know who the speaker was I went on listening for the voice was so very sober and kindly and brave, and what the speaker said was good. Then I heard this phrase which I shall never forget, "Happiness is liberty and liberty is courage." It was your Air Marshal, Billy Bishop, who was speaking and that phrase of his, it seems to me, might well be the slogan under which Canada should fight. It tells the whole story of why we are at war—for happiness. What is happiness?—liberty; what is liberty?—courage.

These people in France who have lost their liberty know how true that is, but I am sure they have not lost their courage. There are signs every day that they are recovering from that dreadful panic which overcame them when the surprise attack of last May caught them unready. They have some bad leaders and bad men in their ranks. Their press is contemptible and, I say it honestly, for it is held in contempt by its readers and even by the newsboys who sell the papers. But the mass of these people have no other aim and hope than to help us throw the Germans back over the Rhine and Moussolini into his Mare Nostrum.

Strange stories are reaching us of developments in Africa, and even stranger stories may reach us soon of trouble within France. The Germans are beginning to squeeze the Vichy Government hard, which is another sign of weakness. Do not let us be impatient. These things have to work themselves out. The only thing we can be sure of is, that we are on the right road and we can keep on the right road, and that these German victories of last spring, while they have had enormous conse-

quences, aren't final victories. They are acts of brigandage and piracy. They were mechanical victories. Now, our tough man, Hitler, is in a fight with real tough men, with men who know what they are fighting for and intend to go on fighting until they have won.

I want to tell you, before I sit down, a little anecdote. One night at the beginning of the war I was wakened in my bed in Paris by an air-raid alarm. It was one of the practice raids before Germans began dropping bombs, so I went to sleep again and I dreamed. I dreamed that I had got into a great long room, about as big as this hall, with a huge window that looked out on snow-clad mountains. I confess to you that I was terribly frightened. I knew I shouldn't be there and that there was a lot of danger. Then I heard someone enter the room. I slipped behind a marble column and stood trembling as I saw a man walk across to the great window and look out over those snow-clad mountains. The perspiration was dripping off me, as it does when I am frightened. Then the man turned and I saw him come across the room. It was Adolf Hitler. I was in his famous Obersalzburg eerie at Berchtesgaden. His face was drawn and haggard. He paced up and down in front of the window once or twice, looking out. Then he walked over to his desk, pulled out the second drawer on the right-hand side, took out a revolver and raised it to his temple—then, of course, I awoke. One always does in dreams just before the bang comes.

But here is a curious thing. On my second night in Canada, about a year later, I dreamed again that dream which I had almost forgotten. Now, I don't believe much in dreams or omens, but I do believe in subconscious foresight and I am telling you of that dream quite seriously because I believe that it will be in that way that this war will end. When that end will come, no one can foretell. We are not engaged in any little war. This is one of those major earth-movements which shape humanity into new patterns. It will leave no man's life unaffected. If we lose, there will be an end to law and liberty as we have known them, just as there was when the German hordes

swept down on the Roman Empire and plunged Europe into the Dark Ages.

If we win, and we can win—it is for you to say we shall win—there will be a new law and a new order. But if we are to win we must hold hard by that courage which is freedom and to that freedom which is happiness. (Applause.)

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON: Gentlemen, so that we may know what one Scotsman thinks of another, I have asked Dr. Parker to express our appreciation to the speaker.

THE REVEREND STUART C. PARKER, D.D.: Mr. President, Guests and Members of the Empire Club: It is a very great honour for one who is not a member of the Club to express your thanks and appreciation to the speaker.

There was a time when I, myself, did not see the value and the significance of the war correspondent. I must say, in extenuation, that I was very young at that time. The war cured me. During the war one lived intensively and by no means extensively. One saw the little bit in which one's work was carried on and knew nothing else. The first man of my own Scottish parish that was killed and appeared on our Honour Roll never knew where he was. He landed in the dark at Boulogne, he went up to the line in the dark, he went into his place and was brought out dead in the dark. So he didn't know very much about the war. I know now that the war correspondent is not only one of the most remarkable figures to-day but one of the most useful. He is required, in the first place, to collate the facts over a wide front, as no soldier-part of the army ever can or would be allowed to do. Then, secondly, it is his task to give to us the atmosphere surrounding the whole situation, and he conveys that, as Mr. Philip has conveyed it to us to-day, by relating his own little intimate observations and telling what he has sensed in his going about from place to place. I, now, with maturer judgment marvel at the war

correspondent for one thing that may not appeal to everyone here as a reasonable cause for wonder. It is not that he braves all sorts of dangers in order to write, it is that he writes at all, because I am perfectly sure that most of us in this room, in the atmosphere in which Mr. Philip has composed many of his despatches, all of them interesting and all of them illuminating, would think of doing nothing but getting under some kind of cover. But the war correspondent and his typewriter cannot afford to pay any heed to it at all, lest his living goes. So I don't know whether this courage is of the very highest moral order, but that it exists, no man can possibly doubt.

Mr. Ferguson has just been saying to me that this is the most human account of things that we have heard recently. (Applause.) I am only sorry that it is not possible for Mr. Philip to make it even more human by relating, as one cannot do in an address, some of the even more intimate, personal details which he has it in his power to tell.

Now, I am sure you have noticed that I have kept away from the fact of his being a Scotsman, and not only that, the most superior kind of a Scotsman, the son of a Scottish Minister. It is a well known fact that Scotsmen—there is nobody here, I am sure, would contradict it—are the best rulers in the world, as well as *being* the rulers of the world in fact. I would venture to say that Scotch correspondents are the very best and the most reliable correspondents in the world.

Now, I think if I make a little boast to that mild extent, you may let me away with it. I won't say any more about Mr. Philip's ancestry and nationality, because there are some people here and there—I don't admire them—who can't stand hearing too much about the Scotch. I might perhaps tell you a story, before I sit down, to show that we are under no illusion about that, we Scotch people. This is an old chestnut now but I had the honour to bring it to this country, so I can safely repeat it, even though you have heard it.

This story is about a big Australian soldier in the last war who, when in hospital in London, was visited by an old lady, one of many other visitors doing good work for the convalescent and sick soldiers. She bored him to death and he replied very little to her remarks. In one pause, to make conversation, she said to him, "You know I am Scotch". He said, "Yes ma'am." Another long pause. Then to resume the conversation and put some pep into it, she said to him, "I suppose you have lots of Scotch in Australia". "Oh, yes, ma'am," he said, "but rabbits are our worst pest." (Laughter.)

After hearing Mr. Philip I think you will agree that there are Scots who are not pests but who are doing a very excellent service for us who are not actually in the thick of things, by letting us know, not only the bare facts, but the atmosphere that surrounds them. I am perfectly sure that with the thanks of the Empire Club, Mr. Philip, there goes to you the assurance that forever hereafter we shall read your despatches with a new interest, and, knowing where you come from, with a new confidence. (Applause.)

“EDUCATION AND THE EMPIRE”

AN ADDRESS BY

THE HONOURABLE DUNCAN McARTHUR,
M.A., LL.D.

MINISTER OF EDUCATION, PROVINCE OF ONTARIO.

Chairman: The President, The Honourable G. Howard
Ferguson.

Thursday, November 28, 1940

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON: Gentlemen: I have the very great pleasure, indeed, to-day to present to you the Minister of Education. It is true, since my day, when I had charge of the educational affairs, that the standards have slipped a bit, but I am very glad to be able to do what I can to encourage our friend, Dr. McArthur.

This is rather an unusual situation. I held that post for a considerable time. My friend, Dr. Cody was Minister of Education, and now we have Dr. McArthur. So it is a sort of “Holy Trinity” that has been running educational affairs for a long time, and to-day I have the very great pleasure and it is a pleasure to me, I assure you, to present to you Dr. McArthur, who, I am sure, is making great progress, many radical changes, and will be the subject of much criticism during his whole career as Minister of Education. (Applause.)

HONOURABLE DUNCAN McARTHUR, M.A., LL.D.: Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Empire Club: I am grateful for the opportunity of discussing with you the education of the youth of this Province in the light of our

experience of war. We regard our system of state education as the servant of the community, entrusted with the responsibility of preparing youth for lives of service which, in turn, will enrich the community. The creation of the good citizen must be the purpose of education. The methods by which this end is sought to be achieved may change from generation to generation, but the purpose remains constant.

Many years ago, a great man, famed for his wisdom, declared that "wisdom is the principal thing, therefore, get wisdom; and with all thy getting, get understanding." The long centuries that have since rolled by have not subtracted one iota from the wisdom of that advice.

What is the nature of the understanding we are warranted in giving to the youth of this Province? We have been inclined too greatly in the past to regard our pupils as separate, independent units, each encased in his own cell and having no communication with the other separate and independent units encased in their cells. We have attempted to encourage the growth of each of these independent and self-contained human organisms, and we have succeeded in a very large measure in imparting information to them, in cultivating their memories and in creating certain intellectual skills.

But our educational policies have been based, in part, on a wrong conception of the real nature of the human material with which we are working. In the presence of three former Ministers of Education, I hasten to add that in saying this I am thinking particularly of the most recent past and of my own responsibility.

These young people in our schools are not separate, self-contained persons; from the time they draw their first breath they are social beings, members of a community. We do right in providing conditions which will contribute to their growth in body and in mind, but we should not overlook the fact that while that growth proceeds they are active members of a community, enjoying the benefits of association with other members of the community, and subject to the obligation of contributing their share to the

life of the community. It is this phase of the life of the child in his relations with other children, the youth in his relations with other youth, the young man and the young woman in their relations to the life of the community.

To-day, we of this country, in association with our brothers of the British Empire, are engaged in the most terrific conflict the world has ever witnessed in defence of human liberty and of the democratic way of life. Sacrifices beyond the possibility of human comprehension are being made, to the end that freedom of thought and of action shall not perish and that our children and their children shall continue to enjoy the right to order their lives in accord with their own desires. These sacrifices will have been in vain if our children are not given an understanding of the freedom which we inherited and which to-day is endangered by the most powerful military force which the world has even known. The foundations of this understanding must be laid in our schools.

Democracy is essentially a thing of the spirit. It is based on a recognition of the supreme value of human personality—of the personality of others as well as of ourselves. The habit of mind which gives recognition to the rights of others, along with other habits of mind, must first be formed in the school, in the ordinary, every-day relations which exist among the children, who are themselves the members of the community formed by the school. For that reason, I maintain that this most important field of human relationship must be brought within the range of intelligent direction and control.

One of the first steps in that process of intelligent direction, which is but another name for education, is the creation in the mind of our youth of some understanding of the meaning of the community. We have not in the past been negligent in the discharge of our duty of informing our youth of their rights and privileges. Nor have they been remiss in the assertion of these rights. For this reason there is need in these days that we should drive home the truth that these rights cannot be enjoyed apart from the community, and, more particularly, that they are

not our creations but a gift, purchased by the communities of our ancestors with the price of great sacrifices and handed down to us freely for our protection. A recognition of our right to liberty must be supplemented by an equally strong and active recognition of our obligation to preserve that liberty.

In actual practice this process of education, in an understanding of the meaning of our rights and of the extent of our obligations, must begin with the privileges actually enjoyed by our children day by day and with the rights which have meaning for them in their own personal experience. As, in the ordinary process of their growth, the horizon of their experience expands and their participation in rights and liberties extends, the development of their sense of obligation should proceed apace. Thus, when they reach the age of maturity, they should undertake the responsibility of citizenship fortified by habits of mind which accustom them to the recognition of the rights of others and of their obligations to the community; to the community as at first represented by the school, and then the municipality, the Province, the Dominion, and, finally, the Empire. Only on this foundation, I suggest, can the structure of democratic living be erected in safety.

To-day, it is with the place of Empire in this gradually expanding sense of obligation that I wish to deal particularly. What are the obligations which we owe to that largest community to which we belong, obligations which we may rightfully expect our youth gradually to understand?

First among these, though possibly not first in importance, I would place our democratic system of parliamentary self-government. This has been the bulwark of our civil liberties. From the days of Magna Charta forward, English people have laboured to make the rule of law supreme in the land. And by law they meant regulations governing conduct, adopted and approved by the duly chosen representatives of the people of the Kingdom. It is true that at first the people entitled to choose representatives to sit in Parliament were relatively few, but the history of British parliamentary government is the story of

two processes—the gradual transfer to Parliament of privileges and prerogatives exercised by the Crown and the gradual extension of the parliamentary franchise.

To what end was this long battle waged? To the end that the humblest subject might order his life as he willed, secure in the protection of the law against even the arbitrary authority of his sovereign. The situation is admirably stated in a debate which took place as long ago as 1647 between representatives of Cromwell's army, on the one hand, and Cromwell and Ireton, on the other. A certain Colonel Rainsboro, representing the army, gave expression to this opinion—"I think the poorest he that is in England hath a life to live as the richest he." "That," says the master of Balliol, "is the authentic note of democracy. The poorest has his own life *to live*, not to be managed or drilled or used by other people. His life is his and he has to live it. None can divert him of that responsibility. However different men may be in wealth, or ability, or learning, whether clever or stupid, good or bad, living their life is their concern and their responsibility."

That is the tradition which we have inherited from our British ancestors. That, too, is the essentially spiritual quality which distinguishes the British conception of the democratic way of life from the ordered regimentation of life in Germany and Italy to-day. This war is being waged because it is a fundamental principle of English life that "the poorest he that is in England hath a life to live as the richest he."

In course of time the heirs of this tradition migrated to this country, carrying with them the British conception of freedom and self-government. But here they encountered a difficulty in that the government of the colonies for generations had been regarded as the special prerogative of the Crown. How could a colonial government be responsible at one time to the Crown in England and to the people in Canada? Failure to solve that problem had caused the loss of the old American colonies; but the genius of British statesmanship, represented by

Lord Durham and by Lord Elgin, discovered a happy and a satisfactory solution. In matters affecting the rights of the Crown, ultimate authority should rest with the Crown; in matters affecting the welfare of the people, ultimate authority should rest with the people. Well did Lord Durham know that the distinction between the two groups of interests was artificial and that, once the principle of responsibility to the local community were conceded, no limit could be fixed to its application. When, a few years later, Lord Elgin assented to the Rebellion Losses Bill, he established in Canada the practice and procedure of British parliamentary government. And thus we came to enjoy the right to manage our own affairs in the way we wished. That right was not wrung from an unwilling Mother Country. It was the gift to Canada of British statesmen, trained in the school of British parliamentary practice. These were our teachers when we were young and inexperienced; their understanding and their wisdom directed us to the enjoyment of the freedom bestowed by British parliamentary government. That freedom we owe to British statesmanship.

The second privilege which has been extended to us by the Mother Country, and one of which we have not taken full advantage, is more difficult to define, but, in my judgment, it is of even greater importance. I can refer to it as the British tradition of service. We have acquired the framework, the bone and sinews and flesh, of the system of British parliamentary government, but the spirit which has given it life and made it a vital institution has been this recognition of the unity of interest of the individual and the community, and the sense of obligation to serve the community. This is the essential counterpart of our rights, and its existence is necessary if we are to follow the British conception of the democratic way of life. This, too, has its roots deep in the soil of British history. It is a happy survival of the English feudal system, a system by which the community was organized on the basis of gradations of rank and property, with each grade owing duties to the one above and recognizing obligations to the

one below. There became ingrained in British thought the idea that the possession of privileges and power was inseparable from the performance of obligations. The waves of time have washed down the peaks and the elevations and filled in the valleys and the depressions. The high and the low have been brought more closely together, but throughout this long cycle of change there has continued unchanged that recognition of obligation as the counterpart of privilege, that true *noblesse oblige*. Without the maintenance of that attitude, as I have suggested, our forms of democracy will remain empty shells, devoid of life, incapable of serving the needs of the community.

The miracle which the British people have performed during the past months can be explained only against the background of that tradition of *noblesse oblige*. They carried into the ordeal of anxiety and suffering a realization of the essential oneness of the community. Sovereign and slum-dweller found common ground in common sacrifice and in the common effort to help their neighbours. And that sense of obligation, strengthened and fortified by suffering, will continue to give courage and endurance to the British people, so long as life itself remains.

Our civilization on this continent has developed under somewhat different conditions. We had barely become established when inventions and discoveries increased manifoldly our mastery of the forces of nature. In an amazingly short time we brought our major resources under our control and, too frequently, we dissipated them with prodigal wastefulness. But in the process we acquired great wealth, and with wealth, great power. The tragedy of our development has been the rapidity with which it occurred. In England, power increased gradually, and in the minds of those entrusted with its exercise there developed at the same time a sense of stewardship, of responsibility to the community. In England, the enjoyment of privilege and power was not regarded as a personal right but as a trust to be administered by the trustee, for the time being, in the interest of the community. We on this continent, on the other hand, have been inclined to re-

gard wealth and power as personal possessions, and our acquisition of wealth has been so rapid that we, seemingly, have not had time to cultivate an adequate sense of obligation to the community for the use of the power which wealth creates. Tradition and practice have given to the British people certain controls over the exercise of power which are effective in protecting the public-interest controls which, unfortunately, have not been acquired to the same extent by the people of this continent. No external control in the form of legislative decree can be as effective as the natural and spontaneous restraints imposed by the conscience of the person who carries with him this inner sense of responsibility, of *noblesse oblige*.

This tradition I regard as one of our richest inheritances if we would only take advantage of it, and I suggest that we must do so if our forms of democratic living are to become real. We stand in special danger just because we are a part of a continental system which, for the reasons I have suggested, has not had the good fortune to carry forward these traditions. For that reason, in my judgment, there are found more of the essential features of democracy in Great Britain than on this continent.

We have been told in this province that, by reason of our participation in a scheme of continental defence, we may expect to turn for guidance and inspiration less to the east and more to the south. I should like to suggest that the qualities and habits of mind of which we stand in greatest need at the present time, if the foundations of our democracy are to be made secure, are those now being displayed by the British people and which incorporate the wisdom of long centuries of experience in providing for the common weal. It should, rather, be our aim to establish firmly and to maintain on this continent an economic, a social and a political order in which the individual will recognize his oneness with the community and in which the enjoyment of privilege or of power will be regarded as a trust to be administered for the benefit of one's fellows. Only in this way will we be made safe for democracy. Our surest guide in the achievement of that goal will be the

assimilation of the traditions and habits of thought of the British people. (Applause.)

The third debt which we owe to the Mother Country, of which our youth should be given an understanding, is that involved in her defence of our shores, of our property and of our institutions. We know that to-day the first line of our defence is the English Channel. We know that the young men of the Air Force, that the sturdy seamen of Britain stand between us and invasion. (Applause.) And we know, further, that our security is not to be found in aircraft, or in guns, or in armour-plate, but in the spirit of the men of the British Services—their courage, their endurance, and, above all, their rugged determination to discharge their duty to the people of their race and Empire. These qualities of character are our first defence. (Applause.)

These are heroic days! The British tradition of service is being enriched day by day by exploits which stir the imagination and which for all time will form part of the record of British achievement. Never before in their history have the British people found their liberties so effectively challenged, and never before has a challenge evoked such greatness of spirit and of character. We owe it to the youth in our schools that they should be permitted to enjoy a feeling of participation in the great achievements which are making these days heroic. They should be enabled to preserve in their memories throughout the long years to come, a record of the deeds of valour which will enrich the British tradition of dauntless courage. Well might they be taken by the kindly hand of imagination to Dover and the Channel ports that they might witness the feverish hurrying of old men and young boys and women of all ages in search of motor-boats, of pleasure yachts, of fishing tugs and of any craft that would remain afloat, and that they might see that strange armada, almost obscuring the waters of the Channel, fighting its desperate way eastward with every ounce of energy because the men of the Empire—Englishmen, Scotchmen, Canadians—were in danger, and that they might witness the performance of

•

that great drama of fortitude and endurance in the blood-stained waters off the coast of Dunkerque, where no thought was of self and only the safety of others was considered. There they would learn that in disaster British character can attain the highest peaks of greatness. It may well be that future generations will think of Dunkerque as the beginning of a new era in civilization.

Or, again, we might take our youth to the bridge of the "Jervis Bay" and watch the gallant Captain Fogarty Fegen drive his ship without faltering into the jaws of certain death, that others of his race and nation might be saved. There they would learn something of the reason for British pride in the quality of its seamen, and, of no less importance, what was meant by the Master when he said: "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

Still yet might we take them to devastated London, where rich and poor together survey the ruins of their homes, where together they seek shelter by day and night from attack from the air, and where together they refuse to bend their souls in submission but with good cheer persist in their endurance. There our youth would learn that through common suffering and common sacrifice the British people have been welded into one community.

A day will come when this war is ended, when we of the British Empire will require all the courage and endurance and understanding that we can muster if we are to solve the problems with which the building of a new world will confront us. Great as has been our need in the past for those qualities of character which have been nurtured by centuries of training in Britain, greater still will be our need in the future. To allow the ties which bind us to the Motherland to become weakened in these days of their great need, and of ours, seems to me but an invitation to disaster. (Applause.) It would be a great tragedy should we in this country, by reason of our security and our ability to pursue without disturbance our quest of ease and comfort, fail to make our own the lessons which, through common sacrifices, are being learned by the people of the

Old Land—the recognition of the essential oneness of the nation and the Empire, and the obligation of service as the counterpart of the enjoyment of liberties. Should we fail to grasp the meaning of these realities, we shall have forfeited our right to partnership with the Motherland in moral and spiritual leadership of that new world which will emerge on the morrow of this war.

I look to the future with confidence. Our young people, it seems to me, approach realities with greater frankness and with greater courage than did their elders. They have lived in a time in which the inability of things material to provide security of mind or spirit has been demonstrated with striking force. Our seeming satisfaction with things as they are in the best of all possible worlds, they regard as a delusion of those who are blinded to realities. If we of our generation can hand on to them a rekindled faith in courage, in honesty, in kindness and unselfishness, in the supremacy of the things of the spirit, we shall have served them well. This may prove to be the crowning achievement of the ordeal of conflict through which we are now passing. It is my sincere hope that our schools may contribute to this end by providing our youth with an understanding of the extent of their obligations to the Mother Country and with an understanding of those qualities of character which have contributed to the greatness of the British people in these days. (Applause.)

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON: Gentlemen, I am quite sure that the rapt attention with which you listened to Dr. McArthur's address will be ample evidence to him of how much we appreciate his thoughtful, inspiring talk upon this vital subject that means so much to us all. That he may understand and have a proper expression of appreciation on your behalf, I am going to ask Dr. Cody if he will say a word on behalf of the meeting.

DR. H. J. CODY: Mr. Chairman, Dr. McArthur and Gentlemen: It is rather a curious thing that all the living Ministers of Education in the Province of Ontario are

present in this room to-day. I have the honour of being the Senior, and next came Mr. Ferguson, then Mr. Henry, and Dr. McArthur. So we, who are ex-Ministers, join with the whole audience this afternoon in expressing to the Minister our appreciation of this magnificently lucid and thoughtful address and our pledge to help him in every way we can in one of the most important tasks that lies before our people, the task of rightly preparing the rising generation for the duties, as well as the opportunities, that lie before them.

It has been a great delight to listen to Dr. McArthur's enthusiastic statement of the case. Being an historian, he rightly paints his picture on a canvas of history. We shall not forget his outstanding points. May I briefly underline one or two that have appealed to me?

First of all, that great definition of Democracy as a way of life whereby each individual may make the best of himself. Democracy does not mean absolute equality, but it does mean that everyone should have the opportunity of making the best of what is in him. He did so wisely and well in bidding us remember that our duties are more important than our rights. Some people are always standing on their rights. Believe me, if you stand on anything too long you may wear it out, and some people so stand on their rights that they tend to disappear. But with rights must also go duties. With privileges must also go responsibility. He has so aptly reminded us that that has been the tradition of old Britain. He who has must give and do and serve. And that, to-day, is the whole ideal of education.

I remember some years ago listening to a distinguished Professor of Education from an institution across the line, who spent the whole time allotted to him on setting forth education as an enrichment of the personality. Of course it is that, but surely it doesn't rest there. Surely it is wise to link with it the ideal of service. Education prepares men and enriches their characters, that they may be better men and women, and serve better in their day and generation. We shall not forget that.

There comes to my mind, Sir, something I read the other day in an English paper, about the issue of the present struggle. You referred, and rightly referred, to our Motherland. A small boy who had been reading in the papers said, "Daddy do the Germans call their country 'The Fatherland'?" "Yes, my boy, they call it 'The Fatherland'." "And don't we call our country 'The Motherland'?" "Yes, my boy, we call it 'The Motherland'." "Hurrah, Dad, we are going to win!" (Laughter.) That boy had great perception. But we shall win, for even weightier reasons. You know, that is not altogether a logical argument to draw great inferences from, in general, but sometimes there is a measure of truth in it.

So, on your behalf, Gentlemen, it gives me the very greatest pleasure to thank Dr. McArthur for this splendid survey of what we have inherited from the dear old Motherland. These are days when we have to examine democracy and find that it is more than a system of government and that it won't run by itself, and we have to examine the basis of democracy. That is what I liked, above everything in his speech. I believe that democracy, founded only on the rights of man is in sore peril in the world to-day, but democracy that is based on the relation of man to God, on the infinite value of the individual, is the only democracy that in the long run will prevail. Thank you, Sir. (Applause.)

"QUEBEC AND PAN-CANADIAN UNITY"

AN ADDRESS BY

THE
HONOURABLE JOSEPH ADELARD GODBOUT,
B.A., B.S.A., D.A., LL.D.

PRIME MINISTER OF THE PROVINCE OF QUEBEC.

Wednesday, December 4, 1940

A Joint Meeting of the Empire Club of Canada and the Canadian Club was held in the Royal York Hotel, Toronto, on Wednesday, December 4, 1940. Mr. R. A. Courtice, President of the Canadian Club, presided.

MR. R. A. COURTICE: Monsieur le Premier Ministre de la Province de Quebec, je regrette sincèrement que je ne parle qu'un peu le français, mais je désire vous faire, a vous aussi bien qu'à Monsieur le Trésorier provincial, un accueil bien cordial. (Applause.)

We extend this cordial welcome to our guest of honour, not as Prime Minister of the Province of Quebec but as a great Canadian who at a critical time is prepared to give practical leadership to a united Canada within the Empire. (Applause.) His election last year marked the passing of the old political régime and the dawn of a new era for Quebec. He is making fundamental changes, modernizing the franchise, education and industry of the province, and rebuilding its finances. His election was an historic victory against the forces of race prejudice and isolationism, as a result of which Quebec is to-day a partner in the Dominion's war effort. (Applause.) In giving a national

outlook to his province and particularly to the youth of that province, he has set an example for the rest of Canada to follow at a time when the need was never so great nor the conditions more favourable.

Gentlemen, it is my pleasure now to present to you the father of a happy family, the classical scholar, the Professor of Agriculture, the successful farmer, the gentleman who saved Quebec to Confederation—the Hon. Adélard Godbout. (Applause.)

THE HONOURABLE ADELARD GODBOUT, B.A., B.S.A., D.A., LL.D: Mr. Chairman, Your Grace, Mr. Ferguson, Gentlemen: I want first of all to thank your President for his very kind words of welcome. I think that if in my whole public life I can do part of what he has described me as having done in the past, I will be quite satisfied. I think that working for unity in Canada is a very great cause and I hope that there is some little thing that I can do to assist our country in this great task. I think it is my duty to thank your President in French, in response to the welcome he has extended to me.

Monsieur le Président, Messieurs: Ce n'est pas la première fois que la voix française de Québec se fait entendre au coeur même du Canada anglais. Ainsi, vous n'avez pas oublié que l'un de mes prédécesseurs est venu traiter devant vous de deux sujets fort captivants, le seigneur et l'habitant canadiens-français. Vous avez accueilli l'orateur avec une bienveillance marquée. Il est résulté de cette rencontre, de cet échange d'idées qui suit toujours une allocution, lorsque discoureur et auditoire sont des amis, une intelligence plus vive de l'histoire, des caractères et des moeurs du Canada français, et, partant, une sympathie plus directe et plus agissante.

De tels contacts sont précieux. Il ne faut point perdre l'occasion de les renouveler; et, lorsque j'ai reçu l'invitation d'assister à vos agapes et de vous entretenir familièrement de quelque chose qui me tienne au coeur, j'ai pensé que

c'était pour moi tout à la fois un plaisir et un devoir d'accepter.

Ces paroles dites, vous comprendrez volontiers, Messieurs, que mon premier soin, après vous avoir remerciés ainsi que vos hôtes distingués, c'est d'exprimer à mes frères canadiens-français qui habitent l'Ontario notre vive affection. Nous les suivons avec intérêt dans les carrières où ils se sont engagés. Ils travaillent avec entrain au progrès matériel et culturel de votre province. Fidèles à leur foi, à leurs traditions, à leur langue, respectueux du bon ordre, ils sont pour vous un véritable acquit. La facilité avec laquelle ils parlent le français et l'anglais leur permet un double regard sur les civilisations fondamentales qui composent le Canada. Aussi sont-ils un lien vivant et nécessaire.

Je salue les représentants des Canadiens français au parlement de l'Ontario. A quelque parti politique qu'aillent leur allégeance, ils se devouent aux intérêts supérieurs du Canada, de leur province de naissance ou d'adoption. Ils comptent justement parmi l'élite ontarienne.

L'un d'entre eux, l'honorable M. Paul Leduc, ancien ministre des Mines, à Toronto, est devenu greffier de la Cour suprême du Canada. Un autre, l'honorable M. Robert Laurier, porteur d'un nom historique, a succédé à M. Leduc comme membre du Cabinet de l'honorable M. Hepburn. Ils sont dignes de leur charge et honorent votre province en même temps que la nôtre. Si j'avais le loisir d'insister quelque peu, vous savez vous-mêmes que cette liste s'allongerait à l'infini.

Mr. President, Gentlemen: When I received your President's invitation to address you, many themes sprang to my mind. But in this hour, when Canada, Great Britain and the British Commonwealth of Nations are having to withstand the savage attack of an enemy without scruple, Hitler, aided and abetted by an understudy without shame, Mussolini, and when the hosts of injustice, trickery and barbarism are in league against our Christian and democratic civilization, it seemed to me that there was but one

subject fitting to this occasion—that of together seeking the most effective means of strengthening Canadian unity the country over.

That, Gentlemen, is well worth dwelling upon in a spirit of generosity, the only spirit conducive to the leading of a really useful beam of light, right into the heart of the matter. For seeking to know our common problems, however thoroughly or well, would be but sterile effort unless a very noble sentiment were to inspire us at every step.

I have not far to look to-day, Gentlemen, to discover a sign of unity. Members of different clubs, or distinct groups, you have left your customary and private cares behind to gather here with but a single desire, a single hope, a single aim: to see that Canada be spared the horrors of war, that we prepare ourselves to stand up to all the dangers that are threatening us and that in the end, Right and Justice, of which the British nations have made themselves the champions, emerge as victors from the most terrible of all world conflicts.

You know as well as anyone how true is the old Gospel proverb that the house divided against itself cannot stand. You have, like us, concern for Canadian unity; and, again like us, considering the facts in a big way, you understand that Canadian unity will be realized only to the extent that the two supreme forces which compose Canada be in perfect accord in all that has to do with the basic factors of Canadian problems. And it is precisely because we are of French blood and English blood, of French culture and English culture, yes, it is because of that very fact that we feel the urge to safeguard the sacred patrimony which our ancestors handed down to us and which your ancestors handed down to you, the principles which lie at the very base of our lives, which condition our lives and which confer on Canada an unquestionable title to an original personality. These values, expressions of our own natures, we superimpose the one upon the other without mixing them. They sustain themselves and they sustain us. They

are our wings, yours and ours, and we are but one at heart in the service of Canada.

That is why, in contemplating the atavistic and rational unity of French-Canadians amongst themselves, which corresponds to the equally atavistic and rational unity of English-Canadians amongst themselves, I have sought for words to best define the close correlation on a higher plane of all Canadians, in every province, from coast to coast. It has occurred to me that the most fitting, the most precise, are these: A Pan-Canadian National Unity to be achieved at the expense of neither the one race nor the other, but to the advantage of all.

That is what Quebec thinks about it; and, I firmly believe what Ontario and the other provinces think about it, too.

We have accomplished much in order that Canada might be Canada and that our country take her rightful place in God's sun. As a consequence, that unity which is so much in question—it is we who desire it in the first place and we have never ceased to strive for it. That is why our attitude towards the war is wholesome and loyal, like yours. In nowise are we sparing of our pennies, our pains, our blood, when it becomes a question of Canada, human liberty, the democratic ideal of honour, which are our very soul. To the truth of this statement my colleagues of English tongue would certainly bear witness in the same tones as I, as the Honourable Mr. Mathewson, Treasurer of the Province of Quebec, who is here with me, could tell you.

The attitude of French-Canadians is explained by the fact that we are the most Canadian of Canadians, in this sense that our roots have been drawing sustenance from the soil of this land for a longer time than those of any other race and have been absorbing the influences of this *milieu* for several centuries.

Indeed, ever since 1534 has Canada been in French thought. Jacques Cartier discovers her, plants the Cross at Gaspé. In the years following he pushes on to Quebec and Hochelaga. Between Cartier's voyages and the found-

ing of Quebec by Champlain, in 1608—without overlooking the founding of Port-Royal, in 1604—Basque and Breton fishermen frequented our coasts and advanced as far as Tadoussac. In 1634, Trois-Rivières was founded and, in 1642, Montreal. The colony suffered vicissitudes but it held good. This little people of a few thousand men spread its influence, gradually but splendidly, as far as the Gulf of Mexico and right to the Rocky Mountains. First explorers, first tillers of the soil, first merchants, first soldiers, first missionaries, first civilizers, we are the foundation, the origin of Canada. Our attachments to France is that of the blood, of language, of culture; but our country, it is Canada; our fatherland, it is Canada; our reason for working, for progressing, for spreading ourselves out, in a word our future as well as our present, it is Canada. And, you, Gentlemen, you as well, the more you count your generations in this land the more you are Canadians.

When France was crushed by the barbarian, our heart bled painfully, even though we were convinced, and are more and more convinced with every day that passes, that she will rise again to take her place beside Great Britain and the sister nations of the Empire. France is the object of our love and the subject of our prayers. We helped to save her in 1914-18. France remains for us as for the rest of the Commonwealth, one of the strongest motives of our ardour in combat.

But our physical and spiritual attachment to France has not prevented our being practical Canadians. When therefore, in 1760, the fight was lost and the *fleur-de-lys* departed across the sea, we understood that Providence had opened to us the door to a new destiny. We were ceded, not vanquished. Our natural inward strength, the Grace of God and the political spirit of London permitted of our getting our second wind, of accepting a new allegiance, another Sovereign, and we became partners in Canadian life, whereas, up to then, we had been the sole masters.

Think a moment of the difficulties we had to overcome. All our leaders, except the clergy, had returned to France

with the officers and the public officials. We numbered sixty thousand, and the flow of English immigration pressed us on every hand. If we turned our faces towards the south, our regard fell upon the rising tide come from New England, where there were about three hundred and fifty thousand people. International trade was forbidden to us, as well as access to public office. We hadn't a crown piece with which to reconstitute our educational system, whereas, Gentlemen, your fathers possessed everything: fortune, influence, credit, success and a thousand facilities for living.

Is it to be wondered at, that we fell back upon ourselves, in the shadow of our belfries; and that there, in close communion with our native soil, we gave ourselves up to reflection, trying to see clearly and get our bearings, succeeding finally, counselled as we were by our bishops and our priests? Certain ones amongst you—and you are not of the number thank God—might have cried out that we were a priest-ridden province. What a gratuitous insult! But it is, precisely, thanks to our pastors that we have been able, without severing our spiritual ties with France, to enter little by little into wholesome relationship with you and to remind you of some concrete facts which you would have perhaps been too long inclined to neglect and of which it was easy to underestimate the importance.

Furthermore, if we were ever solely to follow our religious leaders' advice, even in things temporal, you must admit that, regarding this war, we would not be led astray any more than we have been in the past. His Eminence Cardinal Villeneuve's attitude and speeches have proven, beyond any shadow of doubt, that our Church, just as your own, teaches and wishes nothing but respect for our Sovereign, loyalty to Canada and the British Commonwealth. I do not know how you could not agree with His Eminence who so well continues leading his people, as all our Bishops have always done, according to the example set by Monseigneur Briand and Monseigneur Plessis, in times of stress.

Since then, Gentlemen, our public men, completing the

work of our religious authorities, have been standing up for us and invoking on each occasion when we claimed some one of our rights, our British citizenship. Brothers of those Normans who conquered England under William, we have conquered one by one our political liberties, in a great spirit of loyalty; and when, in 1837-38 we took up arms it was not against our Sovereign but against an oligarchy and a bureaucracy of which we had nothing to expect, and to obtain for ourselves as well as for you a responsible government.

Gentlemen, do not forget that the first Canadian parliament was the Sovereign Council of 1663, established by Louis XIV. And later, under the British Rule, we Franco-Normans, set ourselves to understand you English-Normans, and to enter the progressively freer game of politics.

The Statute of Westminster, the Commonwealth of British Nations—have you ever stopped to ponder that they are not born solely of the Magna Charta? Have you ever stopped to think that the Canadian constitution of 1774, 1791 and 1867 were not a little contributed to by ourselves? When you have balanced the pros and cons of the constitution of 1840 and ascertained why it was not equitable, have you not come to the conclusion that the evolution of minds and the acceptance of the concept of Confederation, the putting into force of that Act, were possible only because we played a large and determining part therein? And what could not be said of 1775 and 1812, when we have done more than our bit in order that Canada should remain British?

Nor do you have to go as far back as that, Gentlemen. In which province is the minority more royally treated, whether from the scholastic or any other point of view, than in Quebec? Do you know of an educational administration more just than ours, better adapted to the facts and to psychology, where English and French, Protestants and Catholics, have sovereign sway over themselves and the education of their children through the intervention of independent committees?

I do not come before you to read a brief or to deliver a panegyric; either would be untimely. I come to bring out the truth, simple and bare. I come to tell you, for instance, that in 1914-18, we wiped a good many things from the slate, even obliterating within ourselves the memory of them, in order to enter the lists at your side. With how much greater zeal are we doing the same thing now! We would not, we could not consent to Canada's being great in war as she is in peace without giving ourselves the joy of serving her.

Happily, Gentlemen, there are many amongst you who have responded to our gesture of brotherhood. I cite, amongst so many others, W. H. Moore, author of *The Clash*; Arthur Hawkes, author of *The Birthright*; P. F. Morley, author of *Bridging the Chasm*; Lorne Pierce, author of *Toward the Bonne Entente*, and of the first work of history and criticism of English-Canadian and French-Canadian literature; Colonel Wilfred Bovey, of Montreal, author of *Canadien*. I should then inscribe on the tablet a Howard Ferguson and a Harry Stapells, who were the instigators of these *bonne-entente* trips to which we so heartily subscribe. I recall to mind the name of F. C. A. Jeanneret, who, for ten years, with the support of the Ontario Department of Education, has been bringing your young professors to French language courses at Sillery College, at Quebec, and has thus developed nearly a thousand teachers into as many propagandists of harmony and concord between the races and the provinces.

And I repeat, Gentlemen, that Pan-Canadian unity is possible, provided we take urgent means to ensure it. When we, the French-Canadians, desire that our children speak English well and make of it their second tongue, all respect being kept for the French language, our sacred idiom, we are not only thinking of giving them thereby access to the various positions in our national economy, but also that we are providing them with equipment which will enable them the better to grasp your thoughts, the better to understand your personal concepts

of civilization, your ways of life and your conduct, for Canadian unity can never be achieved in want of understanding of our respective conditions.

Now, this balance must be thought of as resting on a basis of reciprocal concessions and advantages. It must not occur that at the moment when we in our province are expanding the study of English, restrictions be placed elsewhere on the study of French. It would, I think, be regrettable if, for the sake of economy, any slowing up of effort were occasioned in that direction. Nothing gives us more pleasure than to hear our English-speaking compatriots speaking French. And it cannot be otherwise with you, Gentlemen, I suppose, when you hear us speaking English.

It gives me pleasure to pay this compliment to the English-Canadians of the Province of Quebec, that they are applying themselves with ever more and more success to the study of French. We are grateful to them and we could wish that in every province of Canada our tongue might become more and more popular. When the two master languages of the country are in current use from sea to sea, we will have so multiplied the points of contact between our two races that many of our difficulties will have disappeared of themselves, without the necessity of recourse to persuasion, conventions, press campaigns and the like.

It goes without saying that unity thus conceived will take nothing of their characteristics from any one of our provinces, whether manners, customs, religious practices or cultural life. What we ought to safeguard, what we ought to defend, is the privilege of developing ourselves in our own way. It is in spirit and at heart that we are to unite. The spirit will provide us with a rule for economic, constitutional and social order; the heart with bonds of friendship. In a spirit of respect for one another, what tasks could we not undertake and carry through to successful conclusions!

The present war finds us at this confluence, this converging point of our resolves, this high moment of

our Canadianism. Following the same happy formula, which ought without cease to be reiterated, it is with a voluntary, spontaneous zeal that we have flown to the succour of France and the help of Great Britain.

The French-Canadians, like the English-Canadians, are a constituent part of Canada. They are the majority in the Province of Quebec and, in varying degrees, the minority elsewhere. But, everywhere, they are present; everywhere, they make that presence felt; everywhere, they contribute to the effort of the country as a whole; everywhere, they enrich by their culture, their language, their toil, their devotion, their sacrifices, the patrimony of Canada as a whole. This Canada of ours they will arm themselves to defend against the eventual aggressor, come he from where he may. Gentlemen, our conscripts have nothing to reproach themselves of. They have enlisted with as good heart as have your own. They are doing their duty with the same spirit of discipline as are your sons. The great voice of Canada vibrates in them from fibre to fibre. They are proud of their birthright and, accepting all the responsibilities incumbent upon them, submissive to law and devoted to a great cause, they are proclaiming the efficient accomplishment of the spirit and the letter of the Canadian constitution, not only in this or that particular part of our immense national territory, but from sea to sea, as it is blazoned on the arms of Canada. They believe themselves to be giving sufficient proof of the justice of this principle to make of it the foundation for Canadian unity.

The National Society of St. John the Baptist, of Quebec, has just launched an appeal to French and English-Canadians that they find a "formula of Canadianism having for its purpose the greatness of Canada." This appeal was addressed to the Universities, the press, to each member of provincial legislative assemblies of Canada, and to members of the federal parliament. It is stated therein that complete co-operation between the races is more than ever essential and "that Canadians of French tongue and English tongue have an equal interest

to establish a common idea of their future." One may also read in that appeal that it is time to accord to our province and our people an adequate share of the national defence, responsible posts in the army, the administration and the government.

Gentlemen, I think there is a necessity of putting a little light into this statement. What we claim as French-Canadians is the right and the opportunity to serve Canada, to share with the other provinces, with the other races, with all the other Canadians, the burden of the war and, too, the responsibilities of constructing, of creating a great Canada, devoted to the ideals of the British Empire. I want this statement to be understood that way because it is in my heart that way and it is that way in the hearts of all the people of my province. Influential persons on both sides are besought to devote themselves to the perfecting of a truly mutual understanding.

Gentlemen, if you read the French newspapers of my province, you will note the hearty welcome being given currently to the words of Mr. W. A. Tucker, Deputy for Rosthern, Saskatchewan, in our regard. They are moving to the soul. Spoken recently in the House of Commons, they have echoed far and wide through my province: "Let us strive to show," said Mr. Tucker, "to our compatriots of another Canadian tongue, that they have our fullest respect, and that we are ready to meet them half-way in all that is right and just in the matter of the federal pact."

And I take the liberty of quoting two other passages in the statement of Mr. Tucker: "We will not have a veritable national unity if after having concluded a pact like that of Confederation we proceed to tear it up and dishonour it." And: "It is indeed the genius of the British people to carry out their agreements, to have tolerance and respect for the wishes of minorities, particularly when those minorities, come good days or bad days, have been loyal to the bottom of their hearts."

Strengthened by these assurances and convinced of the justice of our claims, we are not sparing of what Canada

desires of us. Travel up and down my province, see our sons under arms, our workers in the plants and factories, our craftsmen in the workshops, our manufacturers and our public employees in their offices, our merchants at their counters, financial people at their wickets, our farmers in the furrows, even cross the frontiers of our province to east or west, there is not a region where you will not find our people zealous in the service of Canada, sharpening their sword, feeding our troops, the troops of Great Britain and those of the sister nations of the Commonwealth. In the national hive, there is not a French-Canadian bee but brings forth of its honey, beside that of the English-Canadian bee. And I take a pardonable pride in proclaiming again that our English fellow-citizens of the Province of Quebec are as anxious as we to realize that unity at home at the same time as we are preaching it elsewhere.

Unity of thought, unity of purpose, unity of action, fair play all along the line, that is to say unity at the cost of no one of our characteristics or respective peculiarities, there you have what will enable us, once Neo-Paganism is brought low, to look to the future with that serene confidence which doubles the strength of common action.

Gentlemen, your fathers were heroes, and ours, also. In the vibration of your souls and ours we sense unfailingly that all the ancestral virtues are still alive within us.

A list of your contemporary heroes is a long document. Our own is no less so. Here again do we find equilibrium established in the full Canadian unity. Might I mention the glorious feats in arms of two of our people, Corporal Joseph Keable, V.C., and Lieutenant Jean Brillant, also a V.C.? Equals in death, equals in glory, they sleep the sleep that knows no waking, alongside so many of their fellows of whom the unseen sacrifice has made the unknown heroes.

I quote the citation: "Lieutenant Jean Brillant, M.C. 22 Régiment de Québec,

"For most conspicuous bravery and outstanding devotion to duty when in charge of a company, which he led in

attack during two days with absolute fearlessness and extraordinary ability and initiative, the extent of the advance being twelve miles. On the first day of operations, shortly after the attack had begun, his company's left flank was held up by an enemy machine gun. Lieutenant Brillant rushed and captured the machine gun, personally killing two of the enemy crew. Whilst doing this, he was wounded, but refused to leave his command. Later, on the same day, his company was held up by heavy machine gun fire. He reconnoitred the ground personally, organized a party of two platoons, and rushed straight for the machine gun nest. Here 150 enemy and 15 machine guns were captured, lieutenant Brillant personally killing five of the enemy and being wounded a second time. He had this wound dressed immediately and again refused to leave his company. Subsequently this gallant officer detected a field gun firing on his men over open sights. He immediately organized and led a 'rushing' party towards the gun. After progressing about six hundred yards, he was again seriously wounded. In spite of this third wound, he continued to advance for some two hundred yards more, when he fell unconscious from exhaustion and loss of blood.

This splendid example of Lieutenant Brillant on that day fired his men with unsurpassable enthusiasm and ardour and contributed powerfully to the battalion's success."

Now, Gentlemen, do you know what was the last thought of that valiant soul? Give ear to his utterance; I repeat it textually: "*Take me to the rear, that my men might not see me suffer, not that I fear to suffer, but that I fear it might affect and discourage them.*"

Gentlemen, my friends rather, I have let you hear the voice of Quebec and have shown that it differs in no wise from that of our English fellow-citizens, who think as we do in the matter of national unity.

Not one of my words, nor of those which I have invoked is an empty word. Nevertheless, I can but hold my peace after having contemplated the august figure

of Jean Brillant, son of our race, continuator of our history, of which he has signed with his blood a page glorious amongst many others, in order that, having read it, we might make a covenant with ourselves to break no faith with our dead.

Separatists, Gentlemen, we are not; nor could we be. We have made too many sacrifices for Canada. There is not a foot of the soil of the country which has not felt the tread of our people; not a town, not a village but has given birth to a nation builder, to a hero illustrious or unsung. We do not renounce a single parcel of our patrimony, for it is identified with us as we with it. Moreover, you understand us well enough now to know that we will never abandon our brother French-Canadians of other provinces. We only ask that we be respected as we respect others and that our concept of the indissoluble unity of Canada in war and in peace be taken as coming from a heart that is at once fervent and realistic, whose ideal is to serve the nation with all the strength of its being, in order that the opprobrium and the shame of the Nazi yoke be never ours to bear and that the British crown might never cease to find in Canada its brightest jewel.

If my visit here were to result in the closer drawing together of our two provinces which are the headstone of the entire edifice of Confederation, I should thank God that He had made of me the humble instrument of a great work and I should invite you, Mr. President, Gentlemen, to come in turn to the Province of Quebec, to bring us your message of unity and friendship. (Applause—prolonged.)

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON (President of the Empire Club): Gentlemen, during a somewhat lengthy and tortuous public career, it has been my privilege, as well as my ambition, to do what I could to promote good feeling, good will, unity of purpose and thought and action between these two old provinces, Ontario and Quebec, and I have never gone to the Province of Quebec on any mission of that sort that I have not enjoyed a

welcome and a reception, equal to that which you are giving to my good friend, Mr. Godbout. But I also have this thought in mind, and I thought it was perhaps one of the highlights of Mr. Godbout's talk to-day. We are Canadians because we are Britishers, because the British Empire protects us and gives us the right to develop a country here, makes it possible for us to be Canadians, and as it has been said, and truly said, a nation without vision, or a people, must certainly perish. I have always endeavoured to look to the future, rather than to the past. Our friend here has told us his views about the future of Canada and the support that can come from his compatriots in the Province of Quebec.

I am not going to attempt to address you in French or I would make the President of the Canadian Club feel ashamed of the French he uttered to-day. But I have learned this lesson in my movements about the world, that a second language is a useful thing and it costs nothing to carry it about, aside altogether from the cultural uses, and its contribution in a practical way. As you go about the world you will find that almost every country teaches English, makes it compulsory. Even in Japan and Germany, the teaching of English is made compulsory. Why? Because it is the language of commerce the world over and, the British Empire being the greatest commercial enterprise in the world, they have all sought to be able to talk and trade readily and easily with the British people.

I wonder if my friend would object to my making one comment and I don't do it by way of correction? He referred frequently to the Commonwealth of Nations as the great bulwark to which we adhere. Now, the Commonwealth of Nations is but a small part of the British Empire, don't forget that. The Commonwealth of Nations is created by Statute, the Statute of Westminster and it embraces the five great Dominions—The United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa. Now, there are only about seventy-five million people embraced in those areas. They are given certain special privileges. The British Empire is composed of

five hundred million people and if one wanted to realize the extent of the British Empire and its influence, you have only to read the record we get from day to day from the Old Country to see the contributions that come from every part of the world, almost every section of the world, to the war effort in Great Britain. Small little islands, taxing themselves and sacrificing to send money to buy a Spitfire, to send money for some other purpose, to aid in the defence of the Empire.

Now, do you think these people would want to perpetuate an Empire that didn't give them good service? Don't you think it is a mark of appreciation of the type of Empire under which we live and to which we belong?

I have endeavoured, and I am a good example to the younger fellows, I have endeavoured to make use of the wide term "Empire," rather than "Commonwealth of Nations," when I mean the Empire. With all the force that goes behind this great world organization, with the little outposts, strategically scattered all over the world, its influence is unparalleled anywhere in the world by any other nation in all history.

Now, I only got up here to tell you, and I am sure I may do it on your behalf, how glad we are that we have had the privilege and the pleasure of having Mr. Godbout with us and getting the point of view of Quebec with regard to Imperial relations, with regard to Canadian unity and with regard to sharing in the great war effort that means our existence. We expect them to fight for existence as well as we fight for existence. They will do it, I have no doubt.

We will only achieve understanding by coming together frequently to discuss our problems, and in that way we will come under the ægis of a great British Empire, Canadian citizens all, who will make a great contribution to the world's future. We have a great future ahead of us. An unparalleled impetus will be given to Canadian development when this war concludes. There is no question about that in the mind of everyone who gives any thought to these great problems. Where is there another country

in the world with broad acres, with the unlimited resources, both in quantity and variety, with the opportunities for people, with the climate, the good healthy stinging climate, that puts life and energy into everybody? There is no place in the world. And we are going to have hundreds of thousands, if not millions of people in the next generation, coming to Canada. Now, we should be prepared to show them a great example by a united effort, free entirely from local prejudice and local divisions, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, show them that we are devoted to the one great cause in which we are all united, the cause of liberty, the cause of justice and security for the individual.

Mr. Prime Minister, I have very great pleasure as well as honour, on behalf of this splendid audience, of saying to you how greatly we appreciate your making the long trip through the storm to come here and give us the benefit of your views regarding the future of Canada. (Applause.)

"THE DIFFICULTIES OF THE AXIS"

AN ADDRESS BY

EDGAR W. McINNIS, M.A.

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR IN HISTORY, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

Chairman: The President, The Honourable G. Howard
Ferguson.

Thursday, December 12, 1940

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON: Gentlemen, it is a matter of very great regret to me that to-day we open our meeting on a note of sadness. As you are all no doubt aware, the very sudden and untimely death of Lord Lothian took place last night. It is only a few days since I had a lengthy telegram from him promising that he would come and talk to us, and we were looking forward to that with a great deal of pleasure. Aside altogether from that, and much more important, of course, is the fact that a great public figure has been removed from the scene of activity and the Empire has lost a very active and influential supporter at a time when she needs all the best men it is possible to muster. Lord Lothian's career has been a most creditable one. He stands high in the opinion of the British people. He wouldn't have been sent to Washington if that had not been so. He has been doing, in the comparatively short time he has been there, a marvellously successful diplomatic service on behalf of Great Britain, and I am sure that we all regret very deeply the removal from the scene of world activity and Empire unity and action one who has been such a prominent figure. The University of Toronto intended

to confer upon Lord Lothian the highest degree, the highest gift that is in its keeping. He was to have been, on the 16th, made a Doctor of Laws of Toronto University at a special Convocation called to confer this degree upon him and our friend, Air Marshal Bishop, the Lieutenant-Governor and Mr. Moffatt, the American Ambassador to this country. That Convocation, as a result of Lord Lothian's death and out of respect to him has been postponed.

Now, to come to our own problems. I have the very great pleasure of presenting to you to-day one of our learned and influential historians, a man who makes practical application of his knowledge of history and knowledge of world affairs.

We have for a long time, longer than I remember, been in the habit of drawing a fresh profusion of ability and brains from away down by the sea, and Professor McInnis comes just as close to the salt water as is possible. He comes from Prince Edward Island. Since he has been here he has been a great success, not only as a teacher, but as a really human character among the students and there is no better test of a man's worth and his capacity than to have gone through the mill of the mixed student body that are always justly critical—critical as a matter of safeguard, so they won't be overtaken by any high-brow professor.

Professor McInnis was very good in accepting our invitation to say that he would talk to us a bit about the very much tangled and uncertain war situation in the Middle East. I therefore have the greatest pleasure, without occupying any further part of his time, in presenting to you Professor McInnis. (Applause.)

PROFESSOR EDGAR W. MCINNIS: Mr. Ferguson and Gentlemen: We have been watching during the past few months a very interesting phenomena which the Nazis have chosen to call the creation of a new order in Europe. It is really, of course, an attempt on the part of a nation which has suddenly found its plans going somewhat awry

to consolidate the gains which are already made and try to introduce an element of permanence into them, and at the same time to strengthen those foundations still further by drawing within its border certain smaller, apparently helpless states, which have struggled to remain outside.

I don't think any of us are likely to underestimate the significance of this process. I don't think, however, we are likely to believe that it has the same significance as that with which the Nazis so vocally try to credit it. While they regard it as a revolutionary procedure which will make an entirely new world, we must look upon it as a move which is in one sense, at least, defensive, in order to meet new and unfavourable circumstances which have arisen and upon which they had never planned.

The significance goes back to and must be read in the light of one central fact. That is the defeat of the German plans of invasion, as a result of the magnificent work of the Royal Air Force. The more you look at that phenomenon, the more it seems to take the place in the present conflict that the Battle of the Marne occupied in the last war. It isn't itself a final and complete victory. What it is is a crucial defeat of an enemy which makes that ultimate victory possible and even certain. (Applause.) So the result has been the necessity for the Axis to adjust its plans to the entirely new circumstances created by the German failure to get command of the air, and as part of that adjustment they have had to undertake a work in Europe during all the strain and hazard of a continuing war which they hoped they would be able to carry out at leisure and with full attention only when the war was over.

Now, in the process there has emerged a great divergence, and I think we can say a steadily growing divergence, between the two major parties of the Berlin-Rome Axis. Each of them, of course, entered the war purely for his own purpose. I don't think either of them had any illusions about that. But perhaps the split between them which is steadily being shown up as events progress,

has already reached a point which is far greater than even we had reason to expect, however much we may have known of the initial lack of confidence by the two bandits in each other.

I would like first of all, however, before I go to the practical circumstances, to say one or two words about certain features of the mental attitude of these two partners, because I think it does show a significant difference in their whole outlook. Both of them, of course, both Italians and Germans, regard themselves as remarkably superior people, but there is a certain difference in their attitude toward all the rest of the people whom they consider themselves superior to. If you take the Germans, and particularly if you take some of the quotations from the German press during the past six months, I am sure you would be struck, as I have been struck, by the continual recurrence of one adjective, which seems to be a peculiar Nazi favourite. That adjective is the word *degenerate*. It is very remarkable, and perhaps not altogether logical, that whenever the Nazis receive a new setback at the hands of the British, the degeneracy of the British suddenly looms up to infuriate them still further.

I am a little sorry that I couldn't call in a consultant psychologist. I am sure he would have some very interesting things to say about that phenomenon, perhaps not all of them complimentary to the German people. Even without being a psychologist, you can understand that a person like Hermann Goering, who believes himself one of the leaders of the master race, would be extremely annoyed when his Air Force had to deal with a lot of degenerate Spitfires and Hurricanes every time they crossed the channel; to say nothing of the pure Nordic, Mr. Hitler, who is constantly advising Churchill to resign while there is still time and who must be deeply pained when that supreme degenerate sits there organizing British resistance and refusing to accept the fate that stares him in the face. It is true, the use of the word *degenerate* has not been quite so frequent in the last couple of months. It may just be that the Nazis are beginning to think that

the British have a few qualities which they haven't hitherto recognized to the full.

Now, when you look at the adjectives of the Italians, they are equally amusing, but somewhat different. The Italians are so busy telling the world what remarkably fine fellows they are, that they have only a limited amount of breath to spare to tell the world how inferior their opponents are to them. I think perhaps also the Italians, in comparison to the Germans, are weakened by a certain fundamental reasonableness that prevents their rising to the frenzy of their senior partner. For example, the Italians may be a little coy about telling us what battle-ships have been damaged by the British fleet, but I don't think any Italian is likely to scuttle one of his own battle-ships and then try to tell us that this is proof of Fascist valour. They can't quite do away with the idea that in the end their opponents have some relation to the human race. I have no doubt the Italians have several words for the Greeks. They certainly regard them as low barbarians who actually use bayonets, whereas apparently the more civilized races spray their opponents with poison gas from aeroplanes, the way the Italians did in Ethiopia. At any rate, the Greeks have certain human qualities which the Italians are still prepared to admit; and whatever adjectives they are using about the British Fleet, and I am pretty sure some of them are not exactly nice, I am quite sure *degenerate* is not one of them.

Well, that difference in mental attitude may to some extent account for some of the difference in military effectiveness, but what I would like to discuss rather more fully is the difference in the objectives of the war between the two partners. Because Italy and Germany are really fighting two different wars, and one of the things that the Italians are beginning to realize, and one that is perhaps one of the most significant things about Hitler's new order, is that if the Germans win their war, there isn't going to be very much in it for the Italian nation, because the result of a German victory would undoubtedly be a world revolution.

Back last spring, Dr. Robert Ley, in a speech to a group of officials, said that Hitler had made Germany happy, and encouraged by that success he was now going on and make the rest of Europe happy. I think perhaps the Poles and the Czechs and the Dutch could tell us something about that brand of happiness; and we don't need even the speech by Walter Darré, which was published in *Life* a short time ago, to tell us what the German plans for Europe really are. Even if we didn't credit that speech at all, we still have enough indication in other pronouncements and other actions by Germany to know that the ultimate aim is a slave Europe, centering around a master German Government.

Now, Darré, according to this speech, looked forward to that very confidently. He talked about the Nazis as the master race who were predestined to rule other nations worthy of no other fate than slavery. It is quite possible that in the intervening eight months, the Royal Air Force and the British Navy may have cast a few doubts on Darré's theory of predestination, though I don't want to get into a theological discussion on that subject. At any rate, that sums up the German idea. The Nazis believe that Europe needs a master; they have no doubt who that master should be. They believe that German blood is alone sufficient to confer on the Germans not only definite rights, but rights which are supreme against any claims of any other nation. One who doesn't possess German blood has no rights whatever, as far as the Germans are concerned. If Germany wants to improve the standards of living of her people she has a perfect right to enslave all the nations around her. She has a perfect right, according to the Nazis, to say that the French shall cease to be an industrial people and shall become primarily an agricultural country, giving raw materials and food supplies to German industry. They have a perfect right to take from France such industry as she possesses and to organize her along the lines that will most suit the German people. They have a perfect right to turn to the Czechs and the Rumanians and to say they shall provide raw

materials and they shall take German goods on such terms as Germany chooses to dictate.

It isn't, you see, that the Germans prefer guns to butter. It is merely that, like all good bandits, they feel that if you have adequate guns you can get the butter that the other people have, and that has been the foundation of German policy so far.

There is the meaning of Hitler's new Europe. First of all, consolidate your conquests for war purposes. Make these people feed your war machine. Germany needs supplies. The British Navy has cut off supplies from abroad. The bombing raids of the Royal Air Force have reduced the availability of supplies at home. Very well, make that up by turning to the Danish, to the French, to the Balkans and to the Polish supplies. You need a better strategic position. If you don't trust those people to fight alongside your army, at least force them to put their defences and highways and strategic position at your disposal. So, having failed to crush England in the central theatre of action, you may try to strike her a vital blow along the Mediterranean and the Suez Canal.

Of course those war plans are only the beginning. The real significance of the new Europe is the revelation of the permanent plans which Germany entertains for dealing with Europe after the war. Obviously, if Germany is going to master the continent and make the continent serve her economic and political purposes, there can be no really independent nations left on the continent of Europe. There may be shadowy governments. You may have a government like that of General Antonescu. But all those will be instruments, channels through which Germany's orders will go to the mass of the people in Europe, who will be welded into a continental economy, operated solely for her benefit.

Now, if that is to be the reward of victory, it doesn't look like very much from the Italian point of view. Because it isn't merely that Germany is going to allow no rival on the continent. It is beyond that. She is going to allow no nation, friend, rival or enemy, to stand outside

the structure which she is building up; and Italy, like France or Rumania or South Africa, must accept German orders and play her part in the structure that will be created.

But that isn't why Italy entered the war on June 10th, and her purposes are very different indeed. Italy isn't aiming at the creation of a new Europe. All Italy wants is a new map, and that is a very different thing. As I suggested, under the bombast of Mussolini and his Fascist followers, there is a hard core of realism; and however much they may exaggerate their strength in their public utterances, they haven't very many illusions about the reality. Italy knows perfectly well she couldn't aspire to dominate Europe. All she could hope for is to diminish her inferiority in comparison with other European great powers; and a type of war such as that waged by the Nazis, a type of war aim such as the Nazis entertain, is completely outside Italy's powers and Italy's conception. Instead, she is fighting a war of limited liability, almost a war of the sort you find in history in the eighteenth century. She doesn't hope to wipe out her enemies, she only hopes to get something from them as a result of victory. No doubt she, too, would like a few slaves to control for her own benefit. She has tried to get a few in Ethiopia and Albania and found them none too easy to control. She could never hope to keep the whole of Europe in subjection. If she could win a few second-hand colonies, with maybe a couple of Greek Islands thrown in, she wouldn't feel she had done badly; and if she managed to get Egypt and the Suez Canal, she would think that the days of the Caesars were here again. That is all she wants—limited rewards. As long as England and France accept the results and do not try to get them back, Italy is perfectly content to treat the other powers of Europe as associates and equals, and perhaps even as friends.

The trouble with that is, if Germany wins, even if Italy should get Tunis, Egypt and the Suez Canal, they would be of no use to her. They would have to be turned over to uses which the Germans and not the Italians would

dictate. As a matter of fact, Italy is already feeling the pinch, when with a short harvest and a winter facing her she has had to cut down her rations still further in order to provide supplies for Germany. Only from Germany can she get the industrial supplies she needs, and Germany can dictate what she must do in return. I suggest this isn't an outlook which inspires the Italians to fight with a fanatical valour. There were a good many Italians who went into this war doubting whether even Egypt and the Suez Canal were worth it. They must be still more doubtful when they realize that the only result will be to subject not only Italy's gains but the whole Italian nation to the dictation of an outside power. I think if I were an average Italian, sitting in a snowdrift on the Albanian mountainside, reflecting that I was doing all this for the sake of Hitler's new Europe, and at that stage a perfect stranger in a kilt came rushing at me with a bayonet, I think I would give him the right of way and let Hitler stop him if he wanted to.

That isn't the whole story of the Greek campaign, of course. The Italians probably still have good generals, although they seem to be getting rid of them very rapidly, in a wide variety of ways; and although nobody, not even the Italians, would pretend the Italian Army is the best in the world, I think there is no doubt they have good fighting troops. The Greeks did run into some hard fighting, and we are not giving them full credit if we don't realize that. But the Italian troops haven't been properly used, and it is now, I think, a question whether they will allow themselves to be properly used. There must be a steadily growing feeling that it would be just as well for Italy to get out of the war, which after all is coming to mean nothing whatever to her.

Now, even with the hope of success that we have to-day, I am not going to commit myself to the prophecy that we will knock Italy out of the war. That depends on a variety of circumstances. I think we have a reasonable chance. I certainly think that given the success we have already, we are encouraged to try still further. Cer-

tainly if she were left to herself I don't believe we would have very much difficulty, but even if the Germans decide not to leave her to herself it will be some advantage to us to engage German strength at a point where Germany obviously doesn't want it engaged, somewhere where Germany will have less chance of hitting effectively at us, and we will have a better chance of hitting effectively at her. I think there is the growing possibility that Germany may decide it is not worth while trying to save Italy and it would perhaps be preferable to let her go and clear the way for an agreement with France, such as Italy blocked a few months ago. I doubt whether the change would in the end be to the advantage of Germany. I have too much faith in the French people, but certainly that is one possibility of clearing the way in the Mediterranean, of releasing forces which can be used by us in the more vital area nearer home. We have made tremendous advances already. The possession of bases in Crete and Greece has completely altered the position in the Mediterranean from the point of view of strategy. The Italian fleet is no longer pretending that it is master of the Mediterranean, it is considering it is hardly safe even in its own harbours.

By the way, I believe the Nazi press dealt with Taranto in a delightful fashion. The *Frankfurter Zeitung* said: "The true happenings at Taranto are sad enough. Some devil-may-care foolhardy British pilots succeeded in firing torpedoes at Italian warships and damage was done to the Italian fleet. The strength of the Italian fleet has certainly not been increased by this."

That is probably as close to the truth as you could expect a Nazi paper to come. And now alongside Taranto we can set that brilliant and daring action at Sidi Barrani, which we may hope, foreshadows the fate of the Italians in Africa. It looks rather as if the British Army was out to show the Navy that it hasn't a monopoly of the Nelson touch.

But it is at home, of course, that the struggle is really vital, because Hitler is not only the strongest partner, he is the person whose victory really means disaster to the

rest of the world. If it were a case of Italy alone, even in the most unlikely situation that Italy had a victory in sight, it would be possible to make terms which would still allow the rest of the world to live. At the most we would have to hand over some colonies which we would regret but which still would not be the most vital part of the British Empire. But if a victory for the Italian brand of war would weaken the Empire, a victory for the German brand of war would mean the end of western civilization. We can at least agree with Hitler's recent speech in this: There is no point of compromise between the Britain of Churchill and the Germany of Hitler. One or the other must disappear. Not only because the Nazi creed and our creed are different, but because our view of human rights and human values cannot live in the same world as a world in which the Nazi theory exists. (Applause.)

We have become familiar with the phrase "total war." We have learned by the past year's experience something of what that means in practice. We have learned that war must not only be total in its methods. You can't treat war as a sideline to your ordinary life, you must recognize that war *is* your ordinary life until victory arrives. But war must be total in its aims as well. We must make a complete end of the enemy we are fighting. I don't necessarily mean an end physically to the German people; whether you think that might be desirable or not, it is hardly a practical programme. But the power of the German people to impose slavery or the threat of slavery upon the rest of the world is something which we must bring to an end. I think we are learning too, that among the totality of methods is the use not merely of our physical resources, but of just those things which we are fighting to preserve and which distinguishes us from the enemy, that democratic spirit which has again come alive in Britain and is giving Britain that inner pervasive unity and enabling it to make its present magnificent stand.

I think of the saga of the little ships at Dunkerque and of those members of the volunteer fire fighting bri-

gades, who were treated with a sort of friendly contempt before the bombs came over, and then were one of the pillars of resistance, a totally unprecedented and unforeseen situation that was created there, and from the battered common men in the shelters there emerged the shelter marshal to give his patience and tolerance and continual cheerfulness under strain to help resistance to survive. Those are not the things that are developed by a dictatorship, and those are the things which we can make dynamic and alive.

It is not merely institutions which we are defending. If we think merely of parliament or a legal system or matters of that sort, much as we value them, we will have fallen into something the same intellectual situation as the French got into over the Maginot Line, thinking of it merely in a defensive sense, instead of as the essential foundation from which the advance might be launched which would bring victory.

The dynamic use of those qualities which are present in the essence of British democracy, the way in which that can be rallied to a government which will release those energies and show the way, the complete unity of purpose of a trusted people behind trusted leadership is the vigorous offensive part of democracy which we can use.

Once several years ago, when this war was already in sight, a statesman at Geneva made a very true statement that has almost become a platitude. "Peace," he said, "is indivisible." We are learning the truth of that from another angle. War is indivisible, too. No nation in the world stands aside from the effect of the war while it is being waged. No nation in the world but will share the results of the outcome of that war. The choice which faces the world is becoming plainer and plainer — as between Hitler's slave economy and the democracy which can survive only if Britain wins.

We can, I think, offer to the perturbed and frightened nations a prospect of victory which we could hardly claim six months ago. Hitler is destroying any illusion that

any nation may be left free under his control. All that we have to do is to prove that the freedom for which we are fighting is a freedom for others as well as for ourselves. With that we rally around us the forces of free men throughout the world and that is our final foundation of sure and ultimate victory. (Applause—prolonged.)

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON: Gentlemen, I am going to ask our good friend, The Reverend Dr. Sclater, on behalf of all of us, if he will say a word of appreciation to Professor McInnis.

THE REVEREND J. R. P. SCLATER, D.D.: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: It only needs one word from me to express our very deep gratitude to the Professor for a very delightful half hour. He comes, I understand, from *the* Island. And therefore we expect something good, and expecting, are not disappointed. I suppose the reason and justification of that expectation is that the Island has so many of the right stock in it, that it produces the faculty of mind which to-day we have seen displayed, a faculty of most charming, informative, wide, delightful understatement. You don't get any of the kind of wavings and excitement and double-barrelled adjectives that you can listen to any time you turn on the short wave to Germany, but just a quiet, strong, competent and witty, light-hearted and grave-minded statement of certain fundamental facts on which we can comfortably base ourselves.

It reminds me of two little stories, if I may just add them. They both concern extremely pious ladies in the Old Country. One of them, English, and the other, Scottish.

The English Lady not long ago was bombed. The front of her house was badly damaged and the room in which she was sleeping was reduced to some uncomfortable proportions, though the bed was left. Very shortly after the bomb had fallen these rescue squads, of which the Professor spoke, went around to have a look. They

got up in the room and found the bed was empty so they went exploring to the back of the house which was all right and they found the old lady sound asleep in another bed. They said to her, "Were you in that front room?" She said, "O, yes." "Well," they said, "what did you do?" "Oh," she said, "I got up and came in here." "But weren't you frightened?" they asked. "Friends," she said, "I just said over to myself a verse of a hymn, then I said 'To hell with Hitler'; and went to sleep."

Well, we gathered from what our friend has said that Musso has his troubles. I rejoice to think of that. I don't like the chap's face, although I greatly like Italians and I wish they were out of that trouble and safe along with the decent people who have been their friends for—I don't know how long—namely, the people of Britain. They will be there one of these days all right. As for the rest, well from the quite strong statement of our Professorial friend to-day, and with the help of the British Empire, Hitler's progress to the place that the old lady seemed to have an interest in, no doubt in due time will be accelerated. That was the English lady.

The Scottish lady, you will observe, was much more restrained in her language. I only use the language that the first lady used because it is a quotation, and anyhow, because it is theological, and jolly good theology at that, too.

The old Scottish lady was asked, "What do you do in a raid? Do you pray?" She said, "No, I don't think so. The good Lord knows all about it and there is no question which side he is interested in. I just go on with my knitting."

The attitude of the pair is the attitude which has been expressed to us by our friend to-day, for whose most informative and delightful address, we all express our thanks. (Applause.)

"HISTORY OF CHRISTMAS MUSIC"

AN ADDRESS BY

HEALEY WILLAN, MUS.D., F.R.C.O.

Chairman: The President, The Honourable G. Howard Ferguson.

Thursday, December 19, 1940

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON: Ladies and Gentlemen: The time is getting on and we have a bit of a programme. I only want to say a word or two, particularly to the guests who have been good enough to favour us with their presence here to-day. I am sure I need not tell them what the purpose and function and object of the Empire Club is. It is the promotion of the cause of the Empire in every phase, and Canada's relation to the Empire, and the purpose of our Club is to disseminate that view and that opinion all through Canada and as far as we can, influence our friends to the south of us.

It is not only unusual but it is a unique privilege we have to-day and it gives me the greatest pleasure imaginable to welcome our guests from the Old Country. (Applause.) I think all Canadians regard it as a great privilege to have the opportunity of entertaining you as guests, not only at a function like this, but all during the trying ordeal through which your people are being brought and that your friends in the Old Country are suffering to-day. I cannot ever get out of my mind the part that the Britishers are playing in this great world conflict, because it is a world conflict. Great Britain has set the pace. She has made sacrifice inestimable. The little Cockney in the east end of London deserves as much

credit as any of the higher officials for the heroic part he has played in the defence of his home and in the defence of the principles which Great Britain represents. (Applause.)

I have said many times before, and I should like to repeat, that when the story of this war is recorded properly, I think that none will occupy a more prominent and impressive place in history than will the East Enders in London, those who have lost everything they have, many with their families gone, their property, their prospects, and yet they are prepared to say, every day when they crawl out from under the heap of debris, sore and wounded, just living and that is all, "Jerry can't get us down." (Applause.)

That is the sort of spirit that has stirred the world. That is the sort of thing that has given leadership to-day to this great movement that is rolling up behind Britain and the fight that she is making for all civilization as she fights alone, as Mr. Churchill said, but not for herself alone. She is fighting to-day for everybody and it is a very small part that we play when we ask them as we have many times, if they would send us their friends, their relatives, to Canada, and we will regard it as a privilege to take care of them as best we can until all this trouble passes and they are able to go back to that land of beauty and of peace again.

Now, we have with us to-day Dr. Healey Willan, a celebrated musician. I can't say much about him because I don't know anything about music, except that I like it, but I have read of him and heard of him and I have seen him, and I know he is going to give us a delightful bit of entertainment with his Choir, that he has brought with him to-day. I am going to turn the Chairmanship of this meeting over to Mr. Willan now and ask him to carry on the balance of the programme. (Applause.)

HEALEY WILLAN, MUS.D., F.R.C.O.: Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: I think that perhaps of all the occasions when the principles of education were most aptly

elucidated, the most apt is found in *Nicholas Nickleby*. You may remember a certain gentleman there, Dr. Wackford Squeers. He summoned a small boy from his class and said, "Boy, spell window." "W-i-n-d-e-r," said the boy. "That is quite right," said Dr. Squeers, "Now, go and clean it."

Now, I call that perfectly sound from every point of view and I am therefore quite sure when I have to talk to you about carols you won't want to hear how they are spelled, you want to know how they sound, and I am therefore going to make my remarks very brief, indeed, so you may hear them sung.

The word *carol* obviously means a song, and a carol is a type of ecclesiastical folk song. There are carols for all sorts of occasions; but those for Christmas have become far better known than any others, probably due to the humanity of the subject, the time of year, and everything connected with the Christmas season, but there are carols for all the seasons of the year—summer, winter, spring, autumn. There are carols for all the great church seasons—Easter, Epiphany and Lent and there are carols for specified days, such as May Day. The May Day carol is sung every year from the tower of Magdalen College, Oxford, and there are the Cornish May Day songs which may be found in profusion in Cornwall. In the old days there were specific carols written for specific Saint's days. I think I can hardly do better than quote to you this description of a carol:

"The carol is a song with a religious impulse. It may be the embodiment of piety, and devotion, it may breathe a mysticism only too rarely found today. It may tell the story in ballad form and it may also be hilarious, for we must not forget the fact that the song and dance are closely allied. Wholesome merriment is the logical result of a deeply imbedded faith, and seriousness is only sad when it becomes superficial."

I think it would be very difficult to find a better description of a carol than that.

The carol as we regard it to-day actually made its appearance rather late in Christian history and although there is evidence of its earlier beginnings, it is not safe to say that the carol, *per se*, existed much before the fifteenth century. Chaucer speaks of the Sequence, Angelus and Virginen, which because of its lilting melody might almost be regarded as a carol. And we read of Nicholas, the clerk of Oxenford in *The Miller's Tale*, singing one evening to the accompaniment of his "gay sautrye":

"On which he made a brighter melodye,
So swetely that all the chambre rang
And 'Angelus ad Virginen' he sang."

This Sequence is from a manuscript in Cambridge and originated in Dublin about the year 1360.

We are going to sing you six carols to-day and I think it might be advisable, perhaps, if I said a few words about the carols before we sing them to you.

The first one is *All My Heart This Night Rejoices*. This carol is by a German writer of the seventeenth century, George Ebling. As we know, the carol literature of Germany is one of the most beautiful heritages of the musical world and a sad contrast to the doings of to-day.

The next one, *Lullay Myn Lyking* is by Gustav Holst, and the words are fifteenth century. Holst died about six or seven years ago. When I was in Chichester in 1935, I walked around the north transept of the cathedral and saw a tablet on the wall to the memory of Thomas Wilkes, some time organist of the cathedral. He died in 1627, I think. A little further along the wall I saw a tablet to the memory of Gustav Holst, and underneath it, read, "Friend of the music in this cathedral." A very noble epitaph.

The third carol is *Alleluia pro Maria Virgine*. This is a very old type and the manuscript was found in the Bodleian Library in Oxford, dated about 1544; it has been arranged by the late Sir Richard Terry.

The next is a slumber song, a lullaby, again from a German source, *Come Rock the Cradle*, one of the most

beautiful tunes ever written and dates from about the year 1670.

The fifth one is written upon a legendary subject, *King Herod and the Cock*. There is a legend that at the time of the birth of Christ, a rumour reached King Herod to the effect that there has been born a Child who should be a greater king than Herod, greater indeed than the kings of all the earth; this message was brought to Herod as he sat at the banquet table; he swore an oath and said, "If this thing be true, then the roasted cock in front of me here shall rise in his dish and crow three times." The legend says, if I may resort to old English phraseology, that "So it did befall".

The sixth carol is a most interesting one, *In Dulci Jubilo*. This is one of the type known as the Macaronic carols in which there are occasional lines of Latin interspersed. There is a legend that it was revealed in a vision to the great Spanish mystic, Henry Suso, in the year 1336. The legend runs that he heard the carol sung to him in a dream by angels dancing, that he was invited to take part in the dance, and did so, and so learned the carol. The carol appeared in Germany about 1540 and it was translated into the English tongue in 1547. The occasional Latin line rhymes most perfectly with the English translation and is a very remarkable piece of work. The melody is of fourteenth century origin. The version we are singing to you to-day is by the English composer, Richard de Pearsall who lived from 1795 to 1856. He has taken the old melody and the words, of course, and has set it in a most beautiful and, at the same time, most erudite fashion. The character of the carol is emphasized, and under his very skilful treatment it becomes a work of real artistry.

Those are the six carols, Ladies and Gentlemen, which we propose to sing to you, and because of the lateness of the hour perhaps it would be wise if we begin now.

Carols were now sung by the Choir, under the direction of Dr. Willan. (Applause.)

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: I have no doubt you are aware that one of the chief characteristics of the old English carol was that you first of all had a very good meal, which I presume you have already had, and then at the close of the meal, or during the meal, the itinerant singers joined the party and entertained the guests. They sang some carols with a refrain to it, and the guests there assembled did not know the entire carol, but they did know the refrain, and knowing the refrain they all joined in. I am going to suggest that you do the same thing.

In response to the applause "NOWELL" was sung by the Choir, the audience joining in the refrain. (Applause.)

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON: Ladies and Gentlemen: I am going to ask our expert musical commentator to say a word on our behalf—The Reverend Dr. Parker.

THE REVEREND STUART C. PARKER, D.D.: Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: The President at any rate seems to have come to the conclusion that I have, if only one grace, at least a very choice one, the grace of a thankful heart, for this is now the second occasion in quick succession on which he has jumped upon me to express the thanks of the Empire Club. But I do so on this occasion with every readiness, if not with the ease that he imagines, and with willingness at least, partly because of the nature of the address and programme which have been presented to us and partly because of our speaker himself.

There have been people who have questioned the propriety of Christmas observance this year because of the world horror which is upon us. Well, I think that all depends upon how you observe Christmas. If Christmas observance to us is only the ill-fated turkey, plus some holly, Christmas cards and ballyhoo generally, then I think I would agree, but if Christmas observance is to us what it ought always to be, the calling to mind of the greatest fact in human or in cosmic history, then I see every

reason why in these black days we should celebrate even with an unusual enthusiasm. And if there is any way in which to celebrate Christmas it is by the singing of carols which still, I hope in the case of the modern ones, as it was certainly in the case of the ancient or the older ones, the people's expression of their faith in the incarnation. It was expressed in a crude and rude way sometimes. Sometimes in a comical way, but the faith was there and if we need anything in these days it is to do just what the carols do for us and did for those who first composed them. In them we repeat over and over again to ourselves the assurance that God is not only in His Heaven, so that all is right with the world, but God is in the world, and therefore all will yet be right with this world.

As for Dr. Healey Willan himself, I would go a long way to hear him speak about carols or anything else connected with music and a still longer way to hear him play the organ. (Applause.)

I remember, indeed, an occasion when to hear him play I hurried so much that I was fined \$3.00. It was an occasion when he and a visitor from England and a couple of other men went in my car to lunch. I think it was at the Old Mill or some place of the sort. We all came back in my car to Dr. Willan's organ to hear him play certain things, and somebody else was going to sing. I remember the church was bitterly and cruelly cold, but we sat through it that afternoon. But we were in such a hurry to get back to the organ that I failed to stop at a stop street—to stop dead. I didn't feel like stopping dead, I was never so much alive as at that hour, and I was fined \$3.00, but I count it very cheap to be with Dr. Willan and to hear him—even for \$3.00. Very cheap, indeed.

Dr. Willan, as I may say, for the benefit of those who do not follow music, and we all have our own interests of course, Dr. Willan is one of the most scholarly living musicians, as well as being a very great organist. There are among us here in Canada and notably in Toronto—which is a very, very great musical school and centre—a few men—more than are gathered together, I think, in any other large city, perhaps I might say in any

other large city in the world—a few men who are absolutely at the top of their profession and whose names are known the world over. Of these not the least is Dr. Healey Willan, whose compositions for the organ, particularly, are played wherever there is a pipe organ, and all over this round earth. He is, I hope, not another example of the prophet without honour in his own country. I wish I had the eloquence to prove to him that he is given honour in his own country. He is one of the greatest, he is certainly one of the greatest composers in the field of literature for the organ and he is, according to any standard, one of our great living composers. Any of you who have heard, as I have heard twice now, his great “Te Deum”, scored for orchestra, will know that I am not exaggerating. It was played, when I heard it first, by the Summer Symphony—by Mr. Reginald Stewart and the orchestra and sung by the Choir. It was played immediately after Cesar Frank’s great symphony in D Minor, and I think the most illuminating and at the same time most flattering comment I heard afterward was from a young man who was very silent, whom I had to ask as to his opinion about the “Te Deum”. He said, “There was no falling away in standard after Cesar Frank.” It was the greatest compliment that could have been paid to Dr. Willan. Anyone listening to that great work of his might know that we have in our midst here in this city one who is an ornament to its musical life and also the musical life of the larger world.

Now, I say that just in order to show you that these Scots—I am still not a Philistine—can appreciate good music. I still think the pipes are the best music. I know that isn’t an opinion which all of you share. I might tell you a story before I sit down. This is also about a soldier. I think I told you a story about a soldier the last time I was here.

This is a sad story about a soldier near dying at the hospital at Rouen during the last war and the doctor told the Sister of the ward when he was going out that she could give Jock anything he wanted now, because he was headed for death and the Sister was very sorry. They

all were, for they liked Jock very much. So she went to Jock and said, "What would you like?" and he took a quick look at her and said, "Has it come to that, Nurse?" "Yes, Jock, it has come to that." "Well," he said, "I would like to hear the pipes before I go." She said, "Jock if there is a piper in Rouen I will get him." She duly got a piper who played outside the hospital all that afternoon, walking up and down, prancing, as the fashion of pipers is. When the time for his evening round came, the doctor arrived and found the ward in a state of gloom. Knowing how popular Jock was he said to the Sister, "Is Jock gone?" She said, "No, but all the rest are." (Laughter.)

In spite of all that, I still love the pipes and I think Dr. Willan would agree with me that they have a place of their own in human life and in musical life, and I tell you it is a place that it is not easy to drown them out of.

Well, we are very grateful to Dr. Willan and to his singers for being with us this lunch time and giving us this seasonable and very pleasant entertainment. (Applause.)

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON: I know as good a story about the Scotch as that. Two of them were going along and a motor car struck one of them and injured him. A crowd gathered about. They thought the old man had been hurt very badly. After a bit he straightened up and said, "Give me a drink of water," and his friend, Jock said, "Faith, he is still delirious."

Well, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am very grateful to Dr. Parker. You know, I always have a clergyman close by when I am in difficulty and I have found it most convenient and useful. We are also very grateful indeed to Dr. Healey Willan and his Choir for the delightful, though brief entertainment they have given us here to-day.

May I say to our guests, those who are with us for a short time, how delighted we are to have them here to-day and how sincerely we hope they have enjoyed their luncheon and entertainment with their friends in the City of Toronto.

“EMBATTLED BRITAIN”

AN ADDRESS BY

EDWIN S. JOHNSON.

Chairman: The Third Vice-President, Mr. E. F. Thompson.

Thursday, January 9, 1941

Before introducing the speaker, the Chairman made reference to the passing of Mr. John Mackay, a Life Member of the Empire Club.

MR. E. F. THOMPSON: Gentlemen of the Empire Club and our Unseen Radio Audience: Due, unfortunately, to a cold, our President, the Honourable G. Howard Ferguson is confined to his house and therefore I have the extreme pleasure of introducing to you our guest-speaker of the day. He comes to us in the capacity of a military correspondent of the Canadian Press at Ottawa. From that title you will gather that he is a newspaperman. He is actually a great deal more than that. Admittedly he has had some twenty-years experience, having had his apprenticeship with the *Winnipeg Free Press* for a period of four years. He then graduated to the Canadian Press and with them has filled many important posts on both sides of the Atlantic. In the year 1937 he was made Superintendent of the Canadian Press in London, England. In 1938, shortly in advance of the present war he made a very thorough tour of Europe, visiting France, Italy, Germany, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Austria and Poland. He thereby acquired a background which has been of extreme use to him in recent months. During the last war our speaker to-day was a member of the

Royal Flying Corps. At the commencement of the present conflict he was in France very shortly after the war started and he was the first Canadian correspondent at Military Headquarters. He was appointed War Correspondent of the First Division and the Second Division and he filled the same position with the newly formed Canadian Corps, under General McNaughton. Having had so much experience on the actual field of action he is very well equipped to talk to us on the subject of "Embattled Britain", and it is with great pleasure that I give you Mr. Edwin Johnson. (Applause.)

MR. EDWIN S. JOHNSON: Gentlemen: I thank you sincerely for the privilege and honour of being invited to address your great Empire Club—a Club which stands for those fine ideals that have played such a vital rôle in making stronger and more unified this great freedom-loving Empire we all hold so dear.

Somehow I feel almost uncomfortably smug, I might say secure rather, over here, when I reflect on the existence that was mine, and millions of others in England, such a short while ago. Then, as now, death and stark terror rode constantly in the skies, with devastation and suffering on every hand. It all seems so remote now—a horrible nightmare—after enjoying this spell of rest amid the peaceful atmosphere of my native land.

Before I left the British Isles, enemy air-raiders had exacted a heavy toll of life and property in their barbarous campaign of indiscriminate bombing. That wanton destruction is still going on. It is being pursued with all the savagery of an enemy we have learned from past experiences can always be relied upon to act according to the basest instincts of mankind.

But the British people who are writing such a glorious chapter of courage, tenacity and calm determination know that even greater ordeals lie ahead. They have resigned themselves to a war of long duration, soberly aware that they are engaged in a grim fight to a finish. They realize their lot for some time to come will be one of blood, toil,

tears and sweat, the ordeal that Prime Minister Churchill mentioned not so long ago. But withal, their fighting spirit is stronger to-day than ever before. Their morale is sound. They are confident of victory, no matter how great the suffering or what sacrifices the future may demand of them.

I tell you this without fear of challenge for I have just returned from the sordid scene of the Empire's battlefield, the very front line of civilization. With so many others I also have been bombed out of my home and office. Providentially, I escaped death or injury at least a score of times. Just before I was due to leave for Canada one of Jerry's oversized bombs—it was a twelve-hundred pounder—crashed through the roof of the residential building where I had an apartment on the eighth floor. The bomb plowed right through my bedroom and exploded on the floor immediately below. Fortunately I was on the second floor at the time and escaped without a scratch. Six residents who had not troubled to seek shelter were killed and about forty families rendered homeless.

All told, fourteen high explosives and twenty-six incendiary bombs had struck this residential building before I left, which may give you some idea of the concentrated violence of these air attacks.

And so it is throughout the metropolitan area of London and other raid-torn areas. Before my departure I made an extensive tour of London. Hardly a street had escaped pounding. On every hand dwellings, historic buildings and business establishments lay in ruins or bore ugly scars of bomb-splinters, while thoroughfares were pock-marked with gaping craters which had temporarily disrupted utility services and necessitated roundabout traffic detours.

Most of this tragic vandalism has been caused by the night raiders. Except for an occasional lull these destroyers are sure to come over at the approach of dusk. With them comes the terror of the night—wailing sirens, flames from incendiaries, the lurid glow of flares and a rain of shell splinters.

I can tell you the scene almost defies description. One must live through the ordeal of this hell to appreciate its horrors. And while I sincerely trust you will be spared the experience, it is well for all of us constantly to remember the hardships and sufferings these brave people are enduring with such exemplary fortitude.

If Hitler hopes to shatter the morale of the civilian populace by these ruthless tactics, I can tell you he is doomed to failure. A trip into the ravaged areas of East London would convince him of that. Here amid the grim devastation, in what was once a teeming settlement, the spirit of the people has been truly magnificent. Thousands have lost all their worldly possessions and many are mourning loved ones. Yet they remain undaunted, realizing if this terror that threatens them should triumph they would be condemned to a life of enslavement and oppression. The Government has done everything in its power to persuade these people to seek refuge in the country or in some other safer region. Some have gone but the majority have elected to stay, especially women whose husbands are employed in the metropolitan area.

They have adopted the attitude: "If we must be killed, let us all go together." But it hasn't always worked out that way. When a man sets off for work he often returns to a rubble heap that was once his home. His family may have been wiped out or he, himself, may have fallen victim to one of the raider's bombs. In such circumstances it is inevitable that many should have come to adopt a fatalistic attitude. Which reminds me of a rather amusing story about a little London evacuee.

On her first night in the country the youngster was asked if she didn't say her prayers before going to sleep.

"Oh yes," she replied.

"Well, kneel down and I will listen as your mother does," the lady of the house said.

The little girl repeated as usual: "Now I lay me down to sleep," and so on, and then improvised a postscript of her own—"And please God protect Daddy and Mummy from those German bombs, and do, dear God, take good

care of yourself because if anything happens to you we are sunk."

I have told you something of the sordid side of this war of frightfulness which has overwhelmed our people. Of course you have already been made aware of some of its terrifying implications through reports in your daily newspapers. And here may I digress for a moment to pay humble tribute to my former colleagues in the London office of the Canadian Press and those other fine fellows on Fleet Street.

Shortly before I took leave of London a large calibre bomb whined down over our office leaving a yawning crater forty feet wide, and thirty feet deep, on our very doorstep. By some strange quirk the building housing our office escaped with superficial damage while other establishments two to three hundred yards down the street were either demolished or rendered untenable. Since then, however, our staff has been obliged to move into new quarters as a result of damage caused by fire bombs.

Like the soldier in the front line these highly trained Canadian Press newspapermen never give thought to their personal safety. Gathering the facts and getting their despatches off to Canada quickly are their primary concerns. But I can assure you that much of what you read to-day from London and other parts of Britain has been brought to you at the risk of the writer's life and limb.

More than likely these men are carrying on their duties at this very moment to the accompaniment of the air-raid warning. Probably German planes are cruising overhead and bombs are whistling about them. I only hope they are not falling too close.

Much indeed has happened in this topsy-turvy world since seventeen months ago when I had the pleasure of accompanying Mr. Rupert Davies, who is President of the Canadian Press, on an extensive tour of continental Europe.

On that eventful trip there was one particular experience which left a lasting impression on my mind. It was at an informal function given in our honour in Berlin

about three weeks before the outbreak of war, by a group of Foreign Office officials and chiefs of the Nazi National News Service.

Our hosts were quite courteous and friendly. A talkative, blubbery rascal who sat on my left waxed eloquent on the enormous good Britain and Germany could exert if only they would work together and between them take complete control of world affairs. He also dwelt at some length on the great influence that we as newspapermen could wield in putting across that idea.

Champagne and the very best wines had been flowing quite freely—and Mr. Blubber poured down the stuff as if he were trying to float a battleship. Then all of a sudden the alcohol took effect. His tone and manner changed so suddenly I could hardly believe my ears.

"Why has Britain always sought to knead Germany into the dirt and been so unfriendly toward us?" he almost spat at me. "Why have we been refused the return of our colonies that were stolen from us? Why are we being deprived of raw materials we need so urgently, and why are we being cut off from the world's markets?"

"It is because Britain has always sought to gobble up everything for herself and resorted to every device in an effort to keep us, a nation of more than seventy million people, out of our rightful place in the sun," he answered himself.

"But those days are over, I can tell you," he blustered. "We shall show Britain that we are stronger than she thinks we are and before we get through with her the British Empire will be shattered and she will be on her knees crying for mercy. But we won't give her any mercy. Only one all-powerful nation must be allowed to survive and that nation will be Germany."

He gritted his teeth and his eyes bulged almost out of his head as he unburdened himself of this storm of hate. It seems to me that since then I have heard very much the same bombast, truculence and threats from this man Hitler and his lieutenants.

That incident merely confirmed a belief I had held for

a long time—that the majority of Germans have an inbred hatred of the British people and everything British.

Some time before that I was on a visit to the Leipzig Industrial Fair. I met a young Nazi newspaperman there who gave me another insight into things German. Only twenty-two years of age, he had become a blind, unreasoning worshipper of Hitler.

“Why doesn’t Germany settle down to a peaceful way of life and try to compose her differences around the council table?” I asked him.

“Neither I nor any other true Nazi ever question the actions of our Fuehrer,” he shot back. “If he says we must go to war we obey unquestioningly and I for one would willingly give my life if I thought it would help to build up a greater Germany of the future.”

Probably fine patriotism, but it sounded strange coming from a youth of twenty-two. Still, what he said, merely reflected that fanatical belief which has mesmerized Germany’s growing generation and caused it to subordinate everything to the interests of the state and the exaltation of Hitler, their new-found god.

Thus I would warn you that it would be folly to build up false hopes on the possibilities of an early internal break-up of the Nazi régime. There is certainly not much hope of it until Germany has sustained a series of major setbacks.

Whatever Hitler’s plans may be for the future he must survey the present disordered scene with anything but optimism. Conditions in the occupied countries and within the borders of Germany and Italy are far from what axis propaganda machinery would lead us to believe. Italy, reeling under British and Greek pounding is screaming for help. Her effectiveness as an ally may soon be at an end.

Already the spectre of starvation has reared its head in some of the German occupied countries. Food stocks have been looted and plundered by the invaders and although the Nazis have sometimes paid high prices for what they have seized, the conquered people have awakened

to the sad realization that the currency they have received is only worthless paper.

In face of these conditions there has been a growing clamour for Britain to relax her naval blockade to permit delivery of essential food supplies to relieve the plight of these sorely pressed, hungry people. Britain has made certain concessions, but for her to lift the blockade unconditionally, it is submitted, would be tantamount to surrendering her most powerful weapon.

In the opinion of most British leaders the tighter the blockade is drawn the sooner will people now under the Nazi and Fascist yoke rise in revolt and help Britain bring the war to a successful conclusion and with it their own liberation.

Meanwhile, Germany is frantically seeking to institute a reckless counter-blockade of Great Britain. For months she has been waging an unrestricted submarine campaign against Britain's sea-borne traffic. Surface raiders have been at large from time to time, and long-range bombers are now being employed against our convoys hundreds of miles off the west coast of Ireland.

The damage to her ocean commerce has been considerable. We must steel ourselves for even more violent assaults against our maritime lifeline. The gravity of the threat brooks no delay. Britain must be assured of uninterrupted delivery of the equipment, supplies and trained personnel she needs to meet the full power of Nazi hate which we know will be unleashed before long.

North America must be converted into the greatest arsenal in the world.

We must see to it that the productive capacity of industry is mobilized and geared to the highest pitch of efficiency.

We must make the best use of our skilled labour to permit full-out concentration on any and every urgent undertaking.

To meet the large scale productivity of the regimented Axis coalition, workers in the United Kingdom have voluntarily surrendered for the duration, rights and

privileges it has taken them generations to establish. To-day there is no thought of enforcing the forty-hour week, nor is there any talk of strikes and lockouts. These people realize that only through unity and by fighting the enemy with his own weapons—more and better weapons—can victory be assured.

We in Canada must also accept this fact. To make such sacrifices would indeed be no more than what has already been done by our men in the fighting services who are offering their lives for their country.

But our leaders must also make it clear once peace has been won that a new and better order of life will be established—a new order far superior to the totalitarian vision of a super-state, recently outlined by Hitler.

At the moment it may be difficult for most of us to visualize an early end of the present conflict. But we do know it must ultimately be brought to a conclusion and furthermore we are confident victory will be ours. It is then we must be on our guard against the appeasers who, in the past, have urged us to be generous and tolerant once victory has been won.

I have heard it said that the monster we now are fighting does not represent the German people as such but rather the fanatical element comprising the Nazi movement. I confess that I count myself among those who simply cannot see any essential difference between the Germans of the last war and the present generation of so-called Nazis. Any increased barbarity which may be discernible in the Germans of to-day may be ascribed to the advance of science, engineering or what ironically might be described as "improved methods."

For the life of me I cannot see why we who claim to be people of practical common sense should forget that it was the Germans of the last war who succeeded in erasing a good many French and Belgian cities, who shelled open towns, who first used poison gas—as you will recall, against our own Canadian boys at Ypres—that it was Germans who sank hospital and passenger ships without warning and otherwise gloried in a war of frightful-

ness. Nor ought we to forget that German planes and Zeppelins in the last war also bombed London and other British cities. I have no compunction in suggesting that had aerial science been far enough advanced Germany would certainly have wrought just as great havoc then as she is attempting to do now.

We must be sure that once victory is achieved, we win the peace and see to it that wars are forever abolished from the face of the earth.

Now, I would like to take you to another scene that was closely linked with my experiences, that is with our military life.

The long dreary months while Britain was reforming her army after the debacle in France and Flanders have proved a real testing period, I can assure you, for our own Canadian Troops.

During those critical weeks following the epic Dunkerque withdrawal, the First Canadian Division formed the Empire's very spear-head of defence. The men were then and are to-day the most proficient and generally the best equipped troops in the United Kingdom. But constant waiting for something to happen, and disappointment when they marched to the brink of action only to be recalled, was bound to generate a certain measure of boredom. However, effective steps have been taken to counteract this problem.

The men are constantly being given change of scenery, always of course consistent with military considerations. Plans already are in operation for educational, cultural and social diversion during the winter months. More stress has been laid on unit and divisional entertainment and leave is being granted more frequently.

Despite the fact that London has become the principal focal point of the enemy's campaign of hate our Canadian laddies are finding it a magnet of attraction. Not for its amusements and diversions, but for its front-line atmosphere. I have met many of them actually cruising around the city in search of the air-raid hot spots. Few

have relished the idea of returning to what they call "the quiet of the camp."

But camp life for the modern Canadian soldier is not what it was for our men who went overseas a generation ago. Most of you will remember the hardships that the first contingent of that day was called upon to endure—first on bleak, inhospitable Salisbury Plain, and later in the mud and desolation of the battlefields of France and Flanders.

In contrast, our boys to-day are housed in comfortable billets. Their food is good, clothing warm and the majority of them are stationed in areas where they can enjoy the amenities of town life and the hospitality of private homes.

The way the British people have treated our men has been magnificent. And the boys in turn have not failed to show their appreciation. They have conducted themselves like true soldiers and gentlemen and won the lasting respect of the populace.

Since their arrival the Canadians also have made their presence known in more than a front-line sense. During the severe sleet storm of last winter, Ontario Signallers played a vital role in restoring the country's disrupted communications. They strung miles of emergency lines and had services functioning again in record time. British supervisors working with them claimed it was the most thorough and speediest workmanship of its kind they had ever seen.

Again when the threat of invasion appeared imminent last summer, Canadian leaders found they would need a more flexible communications system to ensure the quick movements of troops, equipment and supplies, should a major emergency arise. Plans for through roads and by-passes were drafted but local authorities, without the necessary man-power or machinery, found themselves unable to tackle the undertaking in the time prescribed.

General McNaughton, whose energy and dynamic leadership have brought him to the very forefront of the Empire's military scene, stepped in. He called his

engineers together and told them what was wanted. Seven weeks later a Canadian road construction unit, composed mainly of Ontario boys, had completed a stretch of concrete highway which the local authorities had declared themselves unable to do within eighteen months. More work of this nature is being carried out by our Canadians who revel in the work, feeling as they do, that they are contributing something of lasting value to the Motherland.

The Canadians are also playing an important part in strengthening Britain's defences. By pooling their ideas and scientific resources, the Canadians have added many devices and weapons to the nation's store of surprises to be hurled against the enemy should he ever attempt his threatened invasion, or when we in turn take the initiative. And while the possibilities of a successful invasion are far more remote now than six months ago, there has been no relaxation of our watch and ward.

Many of our leaders are firmly convinced that Hitler is sure to strike—and we know that he hasn't been idle these past months. They argue that he must seek a victory over our land forces or acknowledge defeat. Proponents of this theory admit such a plan would involve tremendous risks but they stress the fact that Hitler has never been concerned about the loss of human life and that he would not hesitate to launch it if he thought there was the slightest chance of success. Our leaders, however, are fully cognizant of these dangers. Defensively Britain is ready to meet this threatened blow with the largest army in her history, marshalled at positions of readiness within her frontiers.

But Britain does not plan to remain on the defensive indefinitely. Shortly before I took leave of the Canadian forces in England, General McNaughton called me into his office and gave me this heartening message:

"We have never lost sight of our determination to carry the war abroad. Every day that passes we are reducing the advantages the enemy has enjoyed and ultimately we shall be in the lead. The equipment situation has improved, enabling us to make excellent

headway with training. Rest assured we will strike hard and effectively when the time is ripe."

That offensive, however, cannot be launched with any assurance of positive success without our fullest aid and also that of the United States.

Britain, fighting grimly with her back to the wall is supremely grateful for the help already forthcoming from North America.

Everyone in the United Kingdom knows that Britain's lifeline across the north Atlantic must be kept open at all costs for the transport of promised war materials to her shores. Similarly, everyone believes that Britain must obtain superiority in the air before she can hope to bring Germany to time.

"Planes, ships and trained personnel" has become the popular slogan. Hence all eyes in the United Kingdom are turned toward this hemisphere. For the average man on the street in Britain the Empire Air Training Scheme represents the key to ultimate victory.

But there is also a prevailing belief in England that the United States eventually will be full-out in the war on our side. The majority of the British people feel that Americans have just as big a stake as they have in the outcome of the war. They believe that if Americans are serious in their faith and love of democracy they should be ready to fight in its defence. But of course they know that Americans must decide that issue themselves.

Many of you may recall Hitler's recent outburst when he said that it pained him grievously to think that destiny should have chosen him to deliver the knockout blow to the British Empire.

We may feel superbly confident that neither Hitler nor anyone else will ever deliver that blow. But we must above everything else be certain that our confidence is not founded on the quicksands of wishful thinking or the equally fatal policy of procrastination and muddling through.

As our gracious Sovereign said not so long ago: "It is not in power of wealth alone nor in dominion over other

peoples that the true greatness of our Empire exists. The end is freedom, justice and peace in equal measure for all."

If we desire to live this civilized way of life we must be willing to fight for it with everything we possess. (Applause.)

MR. E. F. THOMPSON: Gentlemen, on your behalf, I am going to ask another newspaperman, Mr. Main Johnson, to express our thanks to the speaker.

MR. MAIN JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen: I am always very proud of newspaper colleagues who have the ability and the courage to address public meetings. Most of us shelter in the less exposed regions of an office or whatever post we may occupy in the newspaper business, but there are some of the profession who do fulfill this public service of telling audiences like this what they have seen and heard. Mr. Johnson has not lived that sheltered life, as you may well judge from his address, either in France or particularly, and more recently, in London; nor was he in any sheltered position. What newspapermen like about their own colleagues is that if they are good newspapermen, they are at least realistic and objective in their approach, and I know you will agree with me that Mr. Johnson has been realistic and objective in what he has told us to-day.

On your behalf, it gives me great pleasure to thank Mr. Johnson and to express the hope that he will continue to tell the public the facts, particularly, I may say, the information that he has given us about the Canadians in England. There isn't a person in this hall who hasn't either a relative or close friend in England at this time, and to hear first-hand stories of what they are doing and of their condition and their fine morale is encouraging to us.

Thank you, Mr. Johnson, on behalf of the Empire Club. (Applause.)

MR. E. F. THOMPSON: Thank you Mr. Main Johnson, and also Mr. Edwin Johnson. The meeting is adjourned.

"THE RAPE OF NORWAY"

AN ADDRESS BY

HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS PRINCE OLAV
OF NORWAY

Monday, January 13, 1941

A Joint Meeting of the Empire Club of Canada and the Canadian Club was held in the Royal York Hotel, Toronto, on Monday, January 13, 1941. Mr. R. A. Courtice, President of the Canadian Club, presided.

MR. R. A. COURTICE: Your Honour, Your Royal Highness, Your Worship and Gentlemen: Great Britain now is not alone in fighting the battle for freedom. She has been encouraged and aided by the ever-increasing active support of her voluntary Allies. The response of Norway, with her great merchant fleet and her Navy, and the reorganization of her Land Force in Scotland and her Air Force in Canada has been inspiring. To-day we salute Norway in our welcome to a most distinguished visitor to Toronto. His Royal Highness, Crown Prince Olav of Norway.

The Royal Norwegian and British families are closely related. Prince Olav is a first cousin of His Majesty, King George VI, his mother, the late Queen Maude, being a sister of King George V. Prince Olav is here to inspect the Royal Norwegian Air Force unit. We have become very attached to these men at Little Norway, under the command of Captain Riiser-Larsen, and are proud to have them with us.

Prince Olav is a graduate of Oxford and in addition to being very popular with his own countrymen, he is

known internationally as an accomplished skier and yachtsman. He was with the Norwegian Army during the invasion of his country, having the rank of General. Subsequently, with his father, King Haakon, pursued by the Germans, he made a thrilling escape to England where the Norwegian Government has been carrying on the struggle to liberate Norway through an Allied victory.

Gentlemen, it is my great pleasure and my great honour to introduce to you His Royal Highness, the Crown Prince of Norway. (Loud cheers—the audience standing.)

HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS CROWN PRINCE OLAV OF NORWAY: Mr. Chairman, Your Honour, Mr. Mayor, Gentlemen: First of all, I want to express my sincerest thanks for the very kind reception you have given me, and for the very kind words with which I was introduced by your Chairman.

It is indeed a pleasure for me to have this opportunity of seeing so many men, so many citizens of Toronto, as the Canadian Club and the Empire Club have given me this opportunity to meet. I am very glad to be able to say a few words to you. I have been asked by your Chairman to say a few words about the development of the war in Norway and a few remarks on what happened after it was necessary for my father, my Government and myself to leave the country, until I eventually, arrived here in Canada to inspect the Norwegian Air Force in training in the camp of Little Norway in this city.

I am afraid that a great deal of what I am going to tell you, you know more or less beforehand, but I pray for forgiveness for that. As you all know, the attack on Norway started very unexpectedly from our point of view. We knew nothing definite. We had no warning of any kind and the complete surprise by which we were all taken I think proves our innocence in any hobnobbing or wanting to go to war, which has been claimed by our enemies, after we had to retreat from our capital, and later on after retreating from our country.

In the evening broadcast on the 8th of April I heard

in a news item that there was a concentration of German troops on the Danish frontiers, and that there were a number of transport ships lying in the southern part of the Baltic, south of the Danish Islands, and that was all that was said in that bulletin. The Danish bulletins at that time started at a quarter past seven, and the Norwegian bulletins started at seven. The result was the Norwegian bulletin was usually over at seven-fifteen when the other started, and because of the report of the concentration on the Danish Frontier I decided I would like to hear if the Danish Press Agencies knew a little more than the Norwegian Press Agency, and I switched on to the Danish broadcast. They said nothing. This is very interesting. They said nothing about the troop concentration against the Danish frontier, but they did say something which hadn't been on the Norwegian news, for some unknown reason, which was very important, to my mind. That was that a German ship with a lot of men on board and a certain number of horses on board had been torpedoed south of Kristiansand. I thought this was strange. The Germans don't do irrational things and I didn't think they started bringing horses out in transports just to give them air. I thought this was very suspicious. I was at home with my family and I tried through various people to see if they had heard anything about it, if they had any confirmation about this. I got in touch with some people. Some had heard it, some had not. That was all that I heard.

I said to my wife, "I am afraid something is going to happen. It may happen to-night." We decided to get things a little ready, straightened out at home, and that sort of thing, and after we had done a certain number of these things we went to bed in the usual way. There was nothing new about the situation in the last news at a quarter past ten. At about half-past twelve in the morning the telephone rang and I was informed that the Oslofjord had been engaged with ships. They didn't know what nationality they were but they were engaging them and

were trying to stop a big fleet of transport ships from coming up the fjord.

Well, that was very bad news. Of course, we decided we had to get ready to move away or be ready so we could move away if necessary at very short notice, but an hour later the telephone rang and told us some ships had gone past the other ports and were working their way further up the fjords. They were then identified as German ships. We then decided that we really had to get our home in order, pack a few clothes and get ready to move off, because if the ships could force their way up, obviously we couldn't stay where we were.

But an hour later again the King telephoned to me and said it had been decided that His Majesty, the Government, the Norwegian Parliament and as many high permanent officials as they could get, should move out of the town with a train that left at a quarter past seven in the morning. There had been received at four o'clock an ultimatum from Germany which they wanted us to consider and decide on, and the only way they would be able to do that in reasonable peace was to evacuate directly from the capital, straight away.

Well, my family and I went into town and took the train, after going up and seeing my father, and we all went off together on our way to a small town in central Norway. I think it was about one hundred and fifty miles from Oslo—as far as I remember the figures. That railway passes by the military training aerodrome, which was not very far away from me on the way up, and it takes about twenty minutes by train from the main station in Oslo to get up to the flying field. When we got up there the Germans started bombing the flying field, and the train was stopped. Everybody got out of the train and we went down into the subways under the rails and there we were having a first rate view of the aeroplanes coming over and trying to burn up the aerodrome. There were a few aircraft and machines and they were firing and were fired at from the German planes.

After about an hour of this there was a lull in the

operations and they decided we couldn't stay there all day—we had to get the train out. We got the train away and arrived at Hamar in due time. The Germans bombed the aerodrome and left the train completely in peace which was most lucky for us.

A meeting of the Parliament was arranged to debate the question of what should be done about the German ultimatum that was sent in. It was obvious the ultimatum was such as inspired the German Army and Navy to attack Norway, but we had to see what form of resistance to take. We did have a little idea of what the situation really was. When we got up there we were told that Quisling had started a government of his own in Oslo. That was extremely strange to us, and it was quite obvious that this would mean an awful lot of trouble and an awful lot of misunderstanding, because of the fact he called his government "the Government" and used the titles of the various Cabinet Ministers. In other words, he sent out orders in the name of the Minister of Defence—telegrams signed by the Foreign Minister, the Prime Minister or the Minister of War, and that caused an awful lot of uncertainty in the first few days before that got straightened out.

Anyhow, it was revealed that the Germans were forcing their way up to Oslo. They had not yet landed any troops there. The fortresses in the narrowest parts of the fjord kept the Germans out. They had sunk at least one and possibly two big ships, and those ships had gone through up to the capital. The German Air Force had machine-gunned the streets of Oslo and bombed the anti-aircraft batteries, and were threatening to take the airport of Oslo, which is somewhere outside the town—not the bigger one which is at the same time a commercial air field. That was Oslo.

There had been attacks on Kristiansand, which is the biggest town in the southern part of Norway. There had been some bombing, a good deal of the time, of the batteries around about the town. There was also an aerodrome somewhere outside of the town that had been

captured from the air, and ships had forced their way into the undefended harbour after resistance from the destroyer that was stationed at that port. The defences at the harbour of Bergen were pretty old and had not been organized properly. There was just at that time very small garrisons, and they were changed after a certain period. You can't have one garrison in the whole time, you have got to change them. This was a period of changing and the result was the forts of Bergen Harbour were less heavily manned than they should have been, which meant that they could man their guns but they could not at the same time keep up any real protection if troops led in behind them had to choose between manning guns or fighting the infantry troops that came up after them. The Germans succeeded in forcing their way to the front of the batteries and landed troops behind the fort, and that broke the resistance of the main Bergen Fort. The other forts in time had to give up in the same way.

Trondhjem had one small fort, a system of fortresses in the mouth of the fjord. They got a very short range of fire up there because of the lay of the land. Their ships got through the narrows there very quickly, and when they once got through there is nothing that could be done about it. They came in and forced their way through very unexpectedly, as they did everywhere else. The result was that when we arrived at Hamar at about twelve o'clock, the four busiest towns in the country were practically in German hands—the capital, also Bergen, Trondhjem—and a little later we got reports that also Narvik had been captured by the Germans. This was indeed very serious and very sad for us all. It was very serious, apart from the military point of view, but also very serious for the reason that all our big radio stations were stationed along the side of our biggest towns. The result was when they got the towns they also got all the main radio systems of the country and it was very difficult for the Government and for Parliament to give out any orders or any information of any sort that could really reach the people and tell

them what were their orders and what were Parliament's decisions and expectations.

I don't think anyone who hasn't experienced it can really understand what it means not to be able to get into communication with anybody for about thirty-six hours. It was quite impossible for us to get into any proper communication with anybody in any of the various parts of the country, in the main cities of the various provinces of Norway.

In spite of this, Parliament decided that Norway would resist the invasion of their territory and if possible try and drive the enemy out again. The order for general mobilization that was given out or had been given out in the early morning was cancelled by the German-controlled wireless stations, but was repeated by what means the Government had and I think very soon every one understood that it was the desire of the Parliament, the Government, to fight and try to throw the Germans back into the sea, where they came from.

While Parliament was meeting we got word saying that busses full of German troops were on their way up to try and stop the proceedings of Parliament, and of the Government, and arrest them and take them prisoners. Therefore, the meeting had to be broken off and the whole Parliament, the Government, the King, my family, all moved on to a small place called Elverum which is about twenty-five miles farther east. We went over from one main valley to another there. The result was it took time before the Germans could find out which way we were going and it gave us a little more time to discuss these matters which were of great importance, also, of course, not only of practical importance, but also very great political importance. As yet there was no formal decision on what the official attitude of Norway at that time was.

Elverum was also a regimental headquarters and there were stationed there two companies of guards and a few military assistants—batmen, cooks, and so forth—in connection with a rifle range course for officers and non-

commissioned officers. That was just over. We got there, and there our Parliament decided—out of one hundred and fifty members, one hundred and forty-nine were present, and of those present one hundred and forty-eight voted to give the Government all necessary powers to continue the war against Germany and to at all costs retain the Government's independence, even if it meant having to temporarily evacuate into another country. (Applause.)

After this decision was made, Parliament dissolved itself and it was considered that it was impossible to keep any regular parliamentary meetings under the conditions as they were in the country at that time. The Norwegian Government, therefore has power from its last meeting as a free Parliament to carry on the maintenance of Norwegian independence and integrity by all those means that it sees fit, and with that one aim of regaining the integrity and the freedom of Norwegian territory and giving the political sovereignty of Norway back to the free people of Norway. (Applause.)

To achieve this it was necessary to keep the Government of the King in being. In other words, it was necessary to keep him away from the direct influence of the German arms. We had to get in such a position that we could not be taken prisoners by any stray raid that might occur. I say a raid, meaning a raid made by motor cars, tanks and so on.

We had settled down in a small village just east of Elverum where the Government met and discussed in what way we could best conduct the war and the administration of the country in this unprecedented calamity that had come over it.

While we were there the German Minister asked for an interview with His Majesty, with the Foreign Minister and with a small Committee of Members of the Parliament. This was granted and the King went back to Elverum by car. It is not very far. He met the German Minister and he again put forward exactly the same claims as had been put forward to the Government previously—that was

the day before, the 9th of April, at four o'clock in the morning, and repeated, possibly two or three hours after the German ships had actually entered Norwegian waters and were engaged in action with the Norwegian coastal batteries and men-of-war. These claims were exactly the same claims that Parliament had decided not to discuss the day before, so the whole outcome of that meeting was that the King had to say that as a Constitutional Monarch he had to confer with his Government and act according to the will of the Parliament and Government as the representatives of the Norwegian people.

The German Minister went back to Oslo, and the next day a representative came up and asked to see the King again and was then brought up to this small village where we were staying. He came again with new demands, or rather the same demands worded a little differently. There was one difference, that the King could choose his own Government, except that he had to have the Prime Minister that Mr. Hitler wanted. Apart from that they were quite willing to let him have any other person in the Government. He said he had to take the Government list submitted to him by the German Minister. That, of course, again had to be rejected.

Then that afternoon—this was the 11th of April—this little village, which consisted of I think about twenty houses in all, a general store or two, a school, a small hotel, a telephone exchange and a couple of farm buildings, quite close to a crossroads, this small place in which there were no services of any sort and in which the only military objective could be the King and his Government, was bombed by five, at least, possibly eight, German bombers, for one and a quarter hours. The first bombs were incendiaries, high explosive bombs, and afterwards the people were shot at by machine-guns. The population, the Government, the King and myself were then in the woods, taking the protection we could get, and we saw the planes quite plainly coming down over us, dropping their bombs and shooting their machine-guns against these small woods in which we were lying. Luckily, no one was, as far as we

were able to find out, killed in that bombing attack. Five, possibly six houses were completely burned but all the inhabitants had left them before the bombs started dropping. One man, I know, was wounded by stones that flew up after the explosion from a high explosive bomb, and I was told that a small child had been hit likewise, but nobody had been killed or seriously injured in that raid.

Later on, very much later, there was shot down a plane in Northern Norway, and the airman's guide was found, in which it was said he had written down his orders for a certain date and the instructions were "Go to Hamar, where the Norwegian King and Government are. Destroy everything." That was the report. I have never been able to find out—I haven't seen the book myself. Anyway that showed it was not an accident that they did this, and we felt very strongly that this was no accident and that it was necessary to keep with great secrecy where the King and Government were if we were to be able to perform those functions which are necessary for a Government and for the head of the State that has to govern and administrate the country's effort, either in war or in peace.

We got ourselves out of the village by cars and we went down where we were behind the front line which had been organized by the spare troops that could get together from the southern part of the country. Because the Germans had seized all the big towns, they were also in possession of all the mobilization places and the most of the depots of the great majority of our various regiments, such as they were. But inside the country, in the south-east, the regiments that belonged there were able to mobilize their battalions, more or less according to plan and they received, of course, any number of volunteers from other parts of the country that came up. There were men, for instance, that came from Oslo, that came through the woods on skis. Some had their rifles, some had no rifles at all. They had forgotten their rifles but they had organized themselves into small bands which grouped themselves

into companies, and into battalions, and eventually were organized into the bigger units.

There was great disorder and there were great difficulties in the resistance in South Norway, especially in the beginning of the period. The whole of the south-eastern part of Norway was just in the end of winter and you here in Canada know what that means. There was no snow on the roads, and a lot of snow in the woods; there was no snow on the high ground, and snow on the low ground. This greatly increased the problems of transport. You can't use wheels outside of the main roads and you can't use sleighs on the main roads. All these things tended to make a tremendous amount of trouble for these various units as they started their fight.

We were all very pleased when we were told that the British and the French were starting landing troops in the various parts of Central Norway. As time went on these troops came down and the resistance started to grow and we thought that things were looking more hopeful and on the whole, more satisfactory.

Then the Germans started their big air attacks and it became quite obvious as time went on that we couldn't keep any bases without air protection, and air protection was what we couldn't get, because there were no air fields in that part of the country where the initial attack was made. The air fields of any size had all been seized by the Germans on the first day, with the exception of one.

We passed through the Gudbrandsdal Valley, north, up to the small town of Molde, on the other side of the fjord. It is quite a way over there. There we settled down for about a week to work on the organization and administration of the country, to get things settled and get the general run of the country in some sort of order again.

The Germans bombed the small town of Kristiansand, which is of no military consequence at all. There were no soldiers there and there were no ships there of any sort of military value. The little town got completely burned down and I saw the statistics only the other day. There are still eleven thousand people who are homeless in that

whole town, which I don't think had more than fifteen thousand inhabitants when the war started.

Molde, of course, was one of the bases. First of all, it was the resident city of the Government at that time. Then there was a British naval base, and to a certain extent was what we call a military objective in as much as it was the seat of administration. This town was bombed for two days but fortunately it had been evacuated.

The Germans burned out that city very effectively. That was due to the fact that there was very small fire service and the water works were put out of action before the main bombing attack started. I think in these small towns in Norway we did not have more than about a dozen or so firemen and a dozen or so firemen can do no good with twelve big fires starting at once, and even if the ordinary man in the street tries to do something about it, it is impossible without any proper material. In many of these towns the organization of the civilian defence had not been worked up to the high standard that is necessary if you are going to fight fires such as those started by enemy aircraft in a moment of war. We have seen that later on. We have seen that in England. We first saw it in France and Belgium, where it didn't succeed. We have seen how it can be controlled in Great Britain, even if it can at first be very destructive. Because of their organization they have been able to keep them within reason and get them put out before they do too great damage and before they do any vital damage to the various communities in which they have been started.

Well, we left by a British cruiser and went up to Bodo, which as you know is in the northern part of Norway. It is south of Narvik. Great Britain had already built a naval base, and French and British troops had landed there, apart from the Royal Navy, and there we had an aerodrome which was covered with snow but had been cleared by the ordinary labour gangs up there. They were mobilized and told to start at it, and the Royal Air Force established up there a proper air base.

We also had quite a number of those fliers that are

here now in Toronto stationed up there. They got themselves up, eventually, starting in the south with old machines which were not capable of fighting in straight fights with the German bombers or fighters, but they managed somehow to get themselves up. They bombed German concentrations when they could and they collected up in the north where they had time to organize and partly refit.

In Northern Norway things were very much different than they had been in the south. First of all the northern division had been mobilized during the Finnish-Russian war, and the men had all been in service quite recently and had done quite a long time of winter training in consequence of that. Also, the German forces in Narvik were very much hampered by the weather and they couldn't attack the northern part before the first Battalions, the Sixth Division, which is a northern Division was ready for them, and could stop them. That Division got itself in order and started to drive back the Germans as a preliminary to the taking of Narvik and the freeing of that part of the country from the German invaders.

As time went on the French and the Polish troops were landed, in co-operation with the Royal Navy, and assisted by the Royal Air Force, they forced the first landing north of Narvik, on the north of the fjord at Narvik, and cleared up. They worked in close co-operation with the Norwegian troops advancing from the north toward that part of the country. That drove the Germans toward the Swedish frontier and on the north of the fjord which goes in just north of Narvik. I am afraid this is not very clear but when you haven't got a map it is very difficult to give a clear explanation of the lay of the land. Narvik is a small town with a very big harbour and with good facilities for landing. At that point the Swedish side of the frontier is forty miles away as the crow flies, and you come down by railway to the sea which is the port of Narvik, and they load the ships there very much the same as you do at Duluth and the end of Lake Superior. It is run very much on the same lines. I went there and

saw their facilities for loading up ships that were going out on the Great Lakes in 1939 when I visited the United States, and it is very much on the same lines as the harbour of Narvik.

To save time for transports, Narvik is erected on a mass that sticks out into a place where four fjords meet. The one big main fjord comes in and splits into three arms, one going back practically due east; one, roughly, south; and one, roughly, north.

The Germans were originally landed at Narvik and ferried themselves across the fjord to the north and tried to get to the mobilization ground of the Norwegian Sixth Division, which is the northern one. This, however, was not successful, and they were driven back there.

The French were landed on the north side of the fjord and south of the Germans there, and were fighting with the Norwegian troops, fighting from the north, and were therefore driven eastward. That is, north of the main fjord running east and west toward the Swedish border.

Some time later an attack was made on Narvik itself by French—mostly by French and Norwegian troops. That attack was successful, and we drove the Germans out of the town and up along the railway, also eastward toward Sweden.

On the whole the operations around about Narvik were very satisfactory, and the air base just a little further north was getting in good shape, and things were looking quite satisfactory in many ways. We were keeping the German bombers away, that is the fighter squadrons that had come up.

Now, of course, it was about the end of May and the news from the continent proper was not getting very hopeful, it was not very good. It was a great disappointment to us all when the word came that we had to abandon or rather that the Allied troops had to abandon their assistance in the campaign in Norway and they also had to take with them their air squadrons that were stationed at the airport up there. It was obvious without air support and having very little ammunition left, that it was quite

impossible to carry on the fight single handed, especially against the German Air Force. We therefore had to decide whether we were going to throw in the sponge or continue the fight from outside Norwegian territory. After thorough thought and contemplation and in full understanding with the original directions given by Parliament, we decided that the correct thing to do would be to evacuate Norway completely and establish ourselves in England and carry on our struggle for independence from a new base. (Applause.)

The decision, of course, was not an easy one. We knew well what we were doing, how difficult it would be for us all to leave our own country and have to start, so to say, afresh. We brought over (when I say "we", I mean the King, the Government and myself) a certain number of the civil servants to form the centre organization. We brought over what we could, what was left of the Norwegian Royal Navy, some few volunteers from the Army and what we could get away of our Air Force personnel.

We then settled down in England, originally in London, where we were very well assisted in every way by the British Government, to try and reorganize our resistance and partake in the general war against Germany and German aggression.

We arrived in London the same day as the final evacuation of Dunkerque was over, and things were not looking too bright, but the fact that Britain had succeeded in bringing out so many men from Dunkerque gave us all great hope for the future, in spite of how dark and how black things at that time seemed. (Applause.)

After we got to England we had to start the reorganization of our armed forces and continue the administration of what was left of Norway, which was at that time our merchant fleet, and those good Norwegian citizens and our friends which were in residence outside of Norway proper. We were well aware in what we had seen and what we had left that everyone in Norway, while fighting lasted, knew that it was necessary to fight, and that resistance had to be carried on as long as possible and to be

continued if Norway were ever to regain her freedom and independence. Therefore, we tried to reestablish an Army, Navy and Air Force. Naval ratings and ships had come across earlier from other parts of Norway, being driven out and being unable to get back to their bases, they had gone across the North Sea and collected in various harbours in Great Britain.

Certain armies that had been disbanded tried to get themselves up to the north but had to give it up. Some of those had gone across too, in small boats and some in larger boats, and when we arrived in England they had already started in a small way the reconstruction of a Norwegian Army and a Norwegian Navy. The Air Force was at that time completely without material. They had no aeroplanes left, but we had ordered in the United States, long before our war started, planes and bombers and sea-plane bombers which should be delivered to branches of the Norwegian Air Force as soon as possible. Of course, with the general disorganization there was at that time it took some time before these contracts could be straightened out and permission gained from the United States to get them transferred, instead of being shipped to Norway, which was impossible, having them shipped to Canada instead, and the organization of a camp commenced here for the continuation of the training of our air men and for the training of new air men which we hoped to recruit and develop.

There is at this time in Norway a small army group. There are quite a number of various small craft, destroyers, submarines, submarine chasers, and other craft, which are flying the flag of the Royal Norwegian Navy. They are partaking with the Royal Navy in the watching and trying to stop the submarine menace which is one of the problems of this war. Our great, our real asset to the Allied cause, of course, is our merchant navy, which consists of nearly four million tons and about thirty thousand men. (Applause.) Over 80 per cent of the original fleet is outside Norwegian waters to-day and they are all employed through the agency of the Norwegian

Government to the best purpose which they can be placed; partly, directly in the war effort, and partly in maintaining their usual work of being carriers of world trade.

From these sources the Norwegian Government has been able to pay for all their material, pay their personnel and pay for loans in foreign currency, for governmental loans and city and county loans which have been taken up in foreign currency, that is in bonds and in dollars, American or Canadian. (Applause.)

It is quite obvious that the Norwegian Government still exists, both legally and in fact as a paying concern. It is able to pay its own way and it is able to meet all its obligations and it is honestly partaking in the effort that we all partake in, that all here present are partaking in, in driving back the forces of Naziism.

I have been asked by many people, both by journalists and by others if I believe that the British Empire and her Allies will win the war. I have always been able to answer perfectly frankly, that I have seen the British, the ordinary Britisher under the bombardment of London and I have talked to them afterward and I have seen the fighting spirit of the fighting forces. I have seen the work done by the various volunteer services, the fire services, etcetera, and I will gladly say again, that it is my full conviction that if we all do what we can and what we ought to do in thorough co-operation and never forget our goal, we will undoubtedly be victorious in this great fight between the movement for domination of the few, and the government for the people by the people. (Prolonged applause.) I believe definitely that in the long run a free people, knowing definitely what they are fighting for and why they have to fight, are a much better material of which to make a fighting nation than a people who are driven to do what they are told, without any questioning and without any chance of expressing their own views, and being quite refused any participation in their own government for their own good. I do not think it is possible for anyone to be a complete organizer of everybody's welfare, their labour and amusements. It is quite impossible. A sys-

tem, as I see it, like the Nazi system is built on brute force and it has worked its way to its present position with trickery, in a way that to my mind, at least, cannot possibly last, and I feel sure it will not last. (Applause.)

Gentlemen, I am afraid I have taken up a great deal too much of your time and I will end now by saying, as I began, that I am very thankful for having this opportunity of seeing so many of you and giving you a few words about what I have seen and what I have been thinking about in connection with this great struggle that we are all in the midst of to-day. I thank you, Gentlemen. (Applause—prolonged.)

MR. C. R. SANDERSON (First Vice-President of the Empire Club): Mr. Chairman, Your Honour, Your Royal Highness, Your Worship and Gentlemen: I think this has been a great day for the Canadian Club and for the Empire Club. It has been a great day for Toronto and for the whole countryside through which this broadcast has gone—that His Royal Highness, the Crown Prince of Norway, should have come to us to tell us in person something about his country, a country small, yet great, a country humble yet, as he has told us, so valiant. And I think, Sir, if I may venture to say so, this may be a good day for Norway. That so vast an audience of Canadians have come here to listen to you to-day, Your Highness, is proof not only of Canada's interest in your country, not only of Canada's sympathy with your country in this, her time of trouble, but Your Highness, I think you may take it that this great gathering is a token that Canada feels with you and believes with you that these troubles will pass, that these troubles *shall* pass, (applause) and, Sir, that the day will soon come when Norway will once more be re-established as an independent, sovereign, and free state.

Your Highness, we are much in your debt for taking time out of a very busy life to come here and talk to us. (Applause.)

“ADDRESS”

By

HIS EXCELLENCY THE RIGHT HONOURABLE
THE EARL OF ATHLONE, K.G., G.C.B.,
G.C.M.G., G.C.V.O., D.S.O., A.D.C.

GOVERNOR-GENERAL OF CANADA.

Chairman: The President, The Honourable G. Howard
Ferguson.

Monday, January 20, 1941

A Joint Meeting of the Empire Club of Canada and the Canadian Club was held in the Royal York Hotel, Toronto, on Monday, January 20, 1941.

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON: Your Excellency, Gentlemen: I am sure that the fact that we have such a very large and representative gathering here to-day will convey to His Excellency the feeling of good will and enthusiastic devotion entertained by all classes of people in this great city of Toronto. We rather pride ourselves, Sir, that in this city burns eternally and more brightly as time goes on, the light of sincere, whole-hearted devotion to the person and throne of His Majesty, the King, and to his representative in Canada. (Applause.)

Looking back to the epoch-marking visit of Their Majesties recently, it seems to me that we can trace to a large extent the fact that we are honoured to-day by having one so closely allied with the Royal Household representing His Majesty in this country as our Governor-General. (Applause.) The King and Queen, as they travelled from end to end of this extensive country of

ours and found everywhere among all people, without exception, such enthusiastic devotion as was shown them and such entire and whole-hearted respect for the Empire and the institutions that it represents, that I am sure they were impressed with the importance of Canada as one of the great pillars of the Empire structure. It seems to me that it must have come to the mind of His Majesty that this splendid country of ours, playing such a marvellous part, both in time of peace and in time of war, in the maintenance of our way of life, in the upholding of the principles represented by British democracy, the principles of liberty, justice and security for all individuals, was important enough that he should respond to the outburst of loyalty that he found prevailing in this country, and when it became his duty to select someone to represent him in Canada he made the choice of one of the most eminent and devoted public servants, closely allied to the Royal family, as his representative in this great Dominion. It is opportune, I think, at a time like this, when we seek continuously to uphold the light of liberty, to direct the path to freedom and to constantly encourage our people to maintain the principles which have prevailed for centuries in the Old Land and which we have inherited as a rich birthright, and natural, I think, that he should choose one whose background, whose history, whose alliances with his own activity has been so marked and so successful.

His Excellency, as you know, and I do not propose to go over a biography, has served the Empire well as a soldier, as a distinguished leader in the forefront of those who resisted aggression, and those who sought to establish and develop the Christian principles upon which our democracy is founded. Not once, but twice in South Africa was he engaged in military activity and received a great many marks of distinction by way of reward. But even in the broader field of the great missionary work of spreading the cause of Empire, no man in England has played a more eminent or a more successful part in developing the Imperial spirit and an intelligent knowledge

of what Imperial organization means than has His Excellency, our guest to-day. In South Africa, as Governor-General, they loved him and his charming wife, Her Royal Highness the Princess, so well that they kept them there for seven or eight years, rather than the ordinary five. Then I think he had to escape through the wild bush land in the north country to be able to get away. We are fortunate indeed that His Majesty made his choice and that His Excellency accepted so readily the task, burdensome as it be, of travelling this country, disseminating the doctrine with which he is so thoroughly imbued, and keeping alive constantly the doctrine of Empire, and the great leadership that is given by the British Empire to mankind throughout the whole universe.

Your Excellency, it gives me great pleasure to present to you this magnificent audience, representing as it does, every class in this community, in business and in idleness, and every degree of intelligence. I will ask you now to be good enough to address us. (Applause.)

HIS EXCELLENCY THE RIGHT HONOURABLE THE EARL OF ATHLONE, K.G., G.C.B., G.C.M.G., G.C.V.O., D.S.O., A.D.C.: Gentlemen: I am greatly honoured to be your guest here to-day. This gathering is one more example of the kindness and hospitality with which a Governor-General is greeted on taking up his duties in your midst, and I am indeed most grateful to you.

May I thank you also, Mr. Chairman, for the kind things you have said about me. I can assure you that the prospect of making a speech is greatly relieved by the feeling that I am here in this friendly city and in the presence of some of its most distinguished citizens. Moreover, it seems to me particularly appropriate that this should be a joint meeting of the Canadian Club and the Empire Club, for one cannot think of Canada without the Empire or of the Empire without Canada.

There was, I believe, a slight prejudice at one time against the use of the word "Empire" in relation to

Canada. It was, I think, a natural prejudice, for such expressions as "Empire" and "Imperial" carried with them a flavour of domination on the one part and subservience on the other.

My own feeling is that Canada has by now reached such a degree of complete independence and self-assurance as to render unobjectionable the use of a word which connotes a brotherhood of peoples of which we are all justly and mightily proud. The expression British Commonwealth of Nations is, of course, an explicit and correct term with which to describe the self-governing parts of our Empire, but we must not forget that the British Commonwealth of Nations is only a part of that vast collection of peoples of many races, colours, religions and languages which go to make up our Empire and for whose happiness and prosperity we are all, to a greater or less extent, responsible.

Now, Gentlemen, I have been wondering what I should talk to you about and it occurred to me that I might offer you a few observations on a subject that is very much in our minds to-day. Quite simply I propose to speak to you about England and the English Inheritance, for England is, after all, the fountainhead of our modern civilization, the mainspring of our democratic way of life, the sure bulwark against our enemies.

When I travel about Canada, nothing delights me more than to hear England spoken of affectionately as "the Old Country." I notice that on this side of the Atlantic people have a peculiar aptitude for finding words and expressions to describe exactly and vividly some quite familiar object but I have not come across any expression which so accurately reflects the sentiments of those who use it as the expression "the Old Country."

At one time England was a remote and almost unknown island lying outside the sphere of the civilized world. The discovery of America and the ocean route round Africa to the East altered the whole centre of gravity of the world in such a way that England became the starting point of a vast maritime movement and a

world power, and subsequently the clearing house of trans-oceanic commerce and finance. It is, I think, interesting to reflect at this time that perhaps nothing has contributed so much to England's greatness as the discovery of this continent.

From a small island nation of five millions there grew an Empire of four hundred and ninety-three millions, ruling one-quarter of the globe. That rule is now challenged. The toughness of its fabric is being tested just as in the past the structure of other Empires has been tested. They have not all stood up to the test. It is well, I suggest, to examine the causes which have led to the dissolution of the great Empires of history and we find at once that in every case their fall was due primarily to two causes, one basic and the other merely factual. To what extent are those causes operative in the case of the British Empire? Upon the correct assessment of that factor must depend, to some extent, the degree of confidence with which we face the future.

In the first place the great Empires of the past were in essence militaristic, not only in their origin, but in their continuance. They thought and acted in terms of antagonism. Subject peoples were held down by the constant application of force and they broke away when that force was slackened. In consequence, the tendency was always towards a tightening of the bonds of control; and bonds that are continually overstrained must eventually snap.

Rigidity and inelasticity characterized the old Imperial rule; personal ambition and selfishness directed its policy. Peace could never meet its ends. That is the sort of control the totalitarian states are seeking to impose on the rest of the world to-day. The point about it is, that it is hopelessly out of date. Its worthlessness has been proved over and over again centuries ago.

So much for the basic weakness.

The second cause of collapse is simply stated. Rulers and people alike went soft. Luxury and ease corroded their moral fibre. Too much loose thinking, too much intellectual self-satisfaction, too little sense of duty, too

much talk and too little work left them unfitted to withstand the shocks which their policy had rendered inevitable.

And what of ourselves? The basis, fortunately, is not the same. We do not think in terms of antagonism, but in terms of co-operation and compromise. Our Empire is held up not down by common interests and loyalties. So far as concerns that part of it which comprises the British Commonwealth of Nations, there is no central control and there is, therefore, no strain. Our Empire is flexible in structure. The common sense of the man in the street predominates. It is a free association of peoples inspired by a deep respect for the past, coupled with a determination to ensure the security of a great inheritance. For these advantages we have not only ourselves to thank. Our geography has helped us, and we must give credit to our forefathers, for they laid the foundations and handed down to us a legacy of wisdom.

They came from many races, and they brought a variety of experience to the tasks before them. And they enabled us to solve a problem that no other race has solved so successfully except perhaps our neighbours to the South, the problem of reconciling the freedom of the individual with executive efficiency on the one hand and popular control on the other. By finding this solution, and that not by any game of hide and seek, nor even by a conscious effort to formulate constitutions, but by boldly facing such situations as arose and by making many mistakes, our ancestors and we have been able to avoid the sudden violent revolutions that have afflicted other nations while achieving quietly the changes that flow from revolution.

It is this same broad experience of practical things that has engendered in us not merely a spirit of adventure, but a sense of historical perspective, a certain tolerance, a capacity to see the other fellow's point of view, a sense of fairness and a balanced outlook which enables its possessor to have that priceless asset, a sense of humour—the immediate recognition of the incongruous.

Experience too has bred in us a certain dislike of the

doctrinaire and distrust of undiluted logic. "Resign yourself," says M. André Maurois, "to giving your logic a rest when you stay in England." He might have chosen as an excellent but extreme example that epitaph which actually adorns a grave in an English churchyard—

Here lies John Bun
Who was shot by a gun
His name was not Bun but Wood
But Wood would not rhyme with gun
and Bun would.

There you have the fine flower of illogicality, an opportunism with an honest purpose and entire frankness of motive.

This sort of attitude has often resulted in our being misunderstood when we do not act by the logical processes which people expect. We are accused of falsity though we are false to nothing but their expectations and deserve to be accused of nothing worse than adaptability.

Historical analogies are often out of place. For instance, people sometimes say that just as every dog has his day, so all great Empires come to an end. But I would point out that the ultimate destiny of this or any other Empire is not determined by what happened in the past to someone else, but by the present spirit of its people. On the other hand the absence of any true comparison does not mean that the British Empire in its present form will go on forever. Even if it perished to-morrow its legacy would be eternal. But we are confident that it will not perish, neither to-morrow nor the day after, nor the day after that; but the duration of its life and influence depends upon the strength and quality of the bonds which bind its component parts together. There must be two such bonds kept strong and living. The first is a united determination to do what we believe to be right whatever the cost. The second is our unswerving loyalty to the Throne. Of the first I need say nothing, for its truth is self-evident. As regards the second, it may seem out of place for The King's Representative to commend the Throne as an object of loyalty, for no one is more con-

scious than I am of the deep attachment of everyone in Canada, not only to the Throne, but also to the person of The King. But we must never forget that the Throne as we know it and have made it is far greater than anyone who can ever occupy it. It is the keystone of a way of life and a system of government which, with all its imperfections, we believe to be the best that has yet been devised. At any rate, it is ours and we mean to keep it, and when we say we are going to fight for it, we mean that we are going to fight for the cause of freedom of thought and liberty of conscience, and for all the small, humble and harmless things that make up our daily life. And we are fighting not only our own battle for our own freedom. There are millions of people throughout the world, and especially in occupied Europe, looking to us and to us alone for their deliverance. Never have we shouldered such an immense responsibility; never has so much depended on how we acquit ourselves. Let us have no "craven fear of being great," but let us gird ourselves and steel our hearts and clench our fists and prove to all mankind, as we are proving every day, that we have never been so great as in this hour of trial; and let us pay the debt we owe to our fathers that begat us by ensuring that our children and their children, and all those who now suffer humiliation and defeat, will be beholden to us for their salvation, their freedom and their civilization.

This is no new message or exhortation I bring you. In remarkable words written in the early part of the seventeenth century a great English poet wrote as follows:

Oh, how comely it is, and how reviving
To the spirits of just men long oppress'd!
When God into the hands of their deliverer
Puts invincible might
To quell the mighty of the earth, th' oppressor,
The brute and boist'rous force of violent men
Hardy and industrious to support
Tyrannic power, but raging to pursue
The righteous, and all such as honour truth;

He all their ammunition
And feats of war defeats,
With plain heroic magnitude of mind
And celestial vigour arm'd,
Their armories and magazines contemns,
Renders them useless, while
With winged expedition,
Swift as the light'ning glance, he executes
His errand on the wicked, who surprised
Lose their defence distracted and amazed.

There you have in simple language the whole philosophy of our war effort. Could any words more aptly describe the spirit of our people than "plain heroic magnitude of mind"? That is the quality above all others that has evoked the admiration of the world for the people of England. And I am certain that if we in Canada were called upon to face the same ordeal of destruction as our brothers and sisters in the Old Country, we should face our tribulations with the same dauntless courage, the same loftiness of spirit and the same determination to see this thing through.

That idealism coupled with a sound practical endeavour to put forth all our strength, will enable us to prepare what the poet calls a "winged expedition" and so bring us to the ultimate goal of victory. (Applause—prolonged.)

MR. R. A. COURTICE (President of the Canadian Club): Mr. Chairman, Your Excellency, Your Grace, Your Worship, Gentlemen: This has been a great meeting and I am sure that we have all been inspired by the beautiful address which has given all of us privileged to hear it, a real sense of pride in our Governor-General and in our British connections (applause) and further affection, if that be possible, for that wonderful little island, the centre of it all; inspired also, I believe by the feeling that in acclaiming His Excellency we are through him paying the most sincere personal tribute that we can to His Majesty, The King, who has become a symbol to the

whole Empire for courage and devotion to duty. (Applause.)

Your Excellency, in concluding this meeting which you have so graciously honoured, it is my privilege to extend to you the compliments of the Empire and the Canadian Clubs, which I do with the prayer that long before you leave our shores Your Excellency and the Princess Alice may enjoy your stay in Canada in a world again at peace. (Applause.)

THE HONOURABLE HOWARD FERGUSON: Your Excellency and Gentlemen. I am not going to add a word to what Mr. Courtice has so well said by way of appreciation of His Excellency coming here to-day and giving us such an inspiring talk on the theme that is uppermost in all our minds. I do want to draw your attention to this fact, that in this audience, perhaps unknown to us because of his modesty, is a gentleman who has been a sort of Nemesis to me—he turns up everywhere I go. He began yesterday the ninety-eighth lap of this marathon. It is a great pleasure to us all, I am sure, to have with us at this table, our good old friend, Sir William Mulock. (Applause.) This audience knows well—perhaps Your Excellency may not know as well as I do—what his sphere of influence has been in this country. He was Chief Justice of Ontario and he ran all the judicial system. He was Prime Minister of Ontario and he ran the Ontario Government, and down at Ottawa he had another friend who allowed him to run the Ottawa Government. He kept that up until we all went on strike and resisted further to be guided by one who had such personal motives and ambitions as he had. But it is indeed a very great pleasure to us to have Sir William with us to-day. I am sure you all appreciate his presence. Perhaps he will get up and thank me for saying this. (Applause.)

SIR WILLIAM MULOCK: Your Excellency, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Ferguson: Mr. Ferguson is always rejoicing in putting me in an awkward position. I think

he has been most successful on this occasion. Why I should invade this magnificent audience with any words of mine I do not understand, but I do thank the audience for their welcome to me.

It is not my fault I am still on this earth. It is true I have entered upon another year of life, but I am not going to say what sort of a career I shall carry on when I start my second century. That will take care of itself as time goes on.

I mustn't refer to the subject we are gathered for. I have only one thought in my mind—in fact everything else is ousted by what I read at twelve o'clock noon. Perhaps you have not seen the report which is to the effect, if correctly reported, that last July, Great Britain landed wonderful resources and sent a few officers to the southern part of Africa which is associated, of course, with His Excellency, to stir up the natives of South Africa. They succeeded in supplying the natives with arms. To-day's twelve o'clock paper announces that the Ethiopians have risen in enormous masses and cleaned out every Italian in Ethiopia. There isn't one to be seen. And it also announces that two Italian ships of war carrying Italian soldiers to the number of two thousand were sunk in the Adriatic and two thousand poor, unfortunate Italians drowned. How one would like to be present this day in Rome and listen to the conversation between Hitler and Mussolini that we are told is going on at this moment. This is the only thing that is in my mind at this moment—the triumph that is awaiting us and who is there who would dare to think that Great Britain shall ever go down! It is impossible for any British subject to believe. (Applause.)

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON: You know, as usual Sir William has had the last word, and we have listened to His Excellency's charming address, so the function is at an end.

"THE EMPIRE AT WAR IN THE MOSLEM MEDITERRANEAN"

AN ADDRESS BY

TRACY PHILIPPS, M.C., D.C.L. (Hon..)

Chairman: The President, The Honourable G. Howard
Ferguson.

Thursday, January 30, 1941

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON: Gentlemen, I have just said to our guest, Mr. Tracy Philipps, that I don't propose taking more than a moment to introduce a man who has introduced himself pretty well all over the world, one who has had a very remarkable career, not only as a newspaper correspondent, but as a liaison officer of very important missions, a man who has been with men like Allenby and Lawrence of Arabia and men of their time, and one who has made a particular study of the Eastern Mediterranean situation.

I am sure he will give not only a very interesting, but an informative and educational talk that will be of interest to us all. There is a complicated situation that I think none of us understand in the Far East and in the Mediterranean, and I am quite sure that when Mr. Philipps has finished we will have a more intelligent and a more accurate knowledge of just what conditions exist and the trend of events there.

I have now the very great pleasure indeed of presenting to you Mr. Tracy Philipps, who is to address us on "The Empire at War in the Moslem Mediterranean." (Applause.)

MR. TRACEY PHILIPPS, M.C., D.C.L.: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: The central sense of the title which has been sent out on the cards is, I think, concerned principally

with "Britain and the Arabs." We are concerned to know something of the war as it touches the British nations in their relations with the Arabic peoples. It leads us to an understanding of how each regards the freedom for which we are fighting.

Men, we know, have fought in general much less for freedom (and the record of human history I think bears this out), men have fought less for Freedom with a large "F" than they have fought for their *rights*, whether they were rights which men had wished to obtain or whether they were rights which, once they had got, they were determined not to lose. It is thus that we find that mankind have fought much less for Liberty than they have fought for their *liberties*. Perhaps the greatest commentary on Freedom, for both the British and the Arabic peoples, is to be found in the recent and tragic history of the French Republic. For there were found in France a considerable body of men who had not realized that their Freedom was bought at a price. They were pleased to emphasize that, like St. Paul, they were born free. But that is not enough. To be born free, and to take no more trouble about it, is to ask for tragedy. If this basic fact is not realized and is not acted upon, it very frequently happens in history that the same result occurs, because our rights and our liberties have to be bought in every generation anew. It may be that the price may vary with the times, but the price is always high.

If among our statesmen there is a clear, keen foresight of the future and if, in addition, there is a vital vigilance towards rebuilding, and towards reinsuring, for future generations our rights and liberties, it may then be that the price of liberty is not the blood price, but the price is always sacrifice.

And so we look across the border where our great brethren stand and remember that President Roosevelt not very long ago appealed most wisely to the youth of the Americas to probe to the very foundations of our institutions, to see whether they are standing up properly to the stresses of our time. He didn't make that appeal

in order that the weak points might be made manifest or in order to undermine our institutions, but exactly the opposite. It might be as some great leader, looking with conscientious care over some great sea-wall, and seeing the cracks appearing along the line and bidding those for whom he is responsible, whose destinies are committed to his hands, to throw their bodies against those cracks and to underpin the foundations, to reinforce and reinsure for the future the safety of those who lie behind those bastions of liberty and freedom.

So it is with the Arabs. What does it mean for them, this freedom and this war, this conflict for things which they, like ourselves, regard as things for which men fight?

If we turn to the map, we notice there is something that stands out instantly and explains itself to your glance. You have the continent of Europe built up, as it were, upon three great pillars. Those pillars are not only just geographic features of our world. They are something much more than that. They are not mere accidents of nature. Here is the eastern pillar, the Balkan Peninsula, ending in Greece; secondly, the pillar of Italy in the centre; and thirdly, the western pillar (which stands above the ancients' Pillar of Hercules) which is the peninsula of Spain. These three pillars, each in their turn and in their day, the Greece of Athens, the Italy of Rome and the Spain of the time when the Moslem city of Cordoba was the most civilized city of Europe, sent north through these pillars their respective and civilizing missions,—of human freedom, of legal order, and of the relayed torch of learning. Up these three pillars, each in their turn and in their time, there surged up from the warm and lucid south to the cold dark north, the idea of Hellenic freedom which was the freedom of the human mind; from Rome the idea of legal order; and from Moorish Spain the relayed torch of the Arts.

But what is the case to-day? Let us pin down these general observations to a practical application. What are we facing at the present time? Precisely the opposite process is now taking place. Down these three

pillars in turn are pressing the barbarian hordes from beyond the pale. The northern Germanic peoples, who burst over the rim of the Alps to destroy Rome, are once more penetrating into Italy and down the Danube. Already they are menacing Bulgaria, to get down toward the Mediterranean. They are pushing down into Italy where German troops are present, not to reinforce Italy, but to keep the Italian people, who regard the war as "this senseless war," from rebelling against the pro-German clique that have drawn them into it.

On the other side in Spain you can find 45,000 German troops, young men walking about in 'plus-fours,' pretending not to be soldiers.

What, then, is the feeling of the Moslem peoples towards this threatened European interference of the Germanic kind into their world? Before we can appreciate the Moslem world we have lots of brushwood to clear away along the trail. What is "the Moslem World" anyway? Where does it lie? What do they feel about it?

Geographically, the Moslem world starts on the Arabic Atlantic in Morocco and sweeps right around the southern and eastern coast of the Mediterranean all through South Russia, up into the Siberian Steppes, and over into China, half-way to the Pacific. There are whole peoples in Chinese Turkestan who profess the code and creed of Mohammad. And in the other direction, from Egypt through the Arabian Peninsula up into India, where there are 80 million Moslems under the British flag, those great islands that lie not so far from the coast of Australia harbour again many millions of the same faith.

What is the result? What is the application? It is that the Moslem world is like a great sounding board, upon which if a man strike, in any part of the Moslem world with good or evil deeds and with just or unjust governance, those deeds go echoing down the sounding board and end eventually by influencing the hearts and minds of its 200 millions of mankind.

Let us perhaps compare that Moslem world, interpreted in this way, with what is the nearest parallel to

it among ourselves. Let us compare it with the Christian-and-democratic world. Is there more solidarity in the Moslem world than there is among the constituent parts of the Christian and democratic world, between let us say, Norway and Canada, between Belgium and Britain, and between various parts of the world who subscribe to our own ideas of civilization? The answer is "yes." The answer is that the solidarity in the Moslem world is far greater, and that is one of the principal factors we have to deal with in the war in those parts of the world.

For this, there are several reasons. One reason is superficial and the other is deep. The superficial reason lies in reasons of form, outward form, of formulae and of tradition which are an essential part of the everyday life of Islam. For instance, at the same time the same prayers, in the same language, accompanied with the same symbolic gestures, are said, looking in the same direction, toward Mecca in Arabia, by 200 million human beings who turn their fears of perdition and their hopes of heaven to that centre of their spiritual inspiration and of their religious allegiance.

Well, those are things which, although they may be outward forms and formulae, are links which bind men closely together. And so it is that each one of us who may have habituated himself to one compartment of that great Moslem world, will find himself always at home wherever that religion stands, and that is a matter of great importance when you are fighting partly upon the territories of people who hold that creed. You cannot fight in any people's land without taking into account for what they stand, what they stand for in the way of provisions that they can give, in the way of transport which they can offer, and in their labour which they can hire out and, above all, in the information they can give you or withhold, or the information, on the other hand, which can conversely be given to your enemies.

Well, what, in that case, of two countries which are being used at the present time quite clearly as Hitler's spearheads—Italy and Spain? They already hold in the

Moslem world places which can become bridge-heads for Hitler. What influence have they, you will say, in the area of which we speak?

Let me be quite precise. There is no difficulty about it. It is quite clear.

In Spanish Morocco there are some 700,000 Moslems, Moors who are subjects of Spain. In Italian Libya the number is almost the same. What is the effect? What is the influence? It is this, that they are too few and they are too localized to give the Spaniards or the Italians, the Government of Spain or the Government of Italy, any sense of responsibility. But their Moslem subjects are just enough to give those Governments an excuse for interfering everywhere in the length and breadth of Moslem affairs from, as we said, the Arabic Atlantic to mid-China. That is the position, at the present time in the war, of those two spearheads of Hitler's working in the Southern Mediterranean and throughout the Moslem world.

For us, for the Governments of France and of Britain, always that situation, where there are millions of Moslem subjects, has induced a deep sense of responsibility. It is precisely the opposite with Hitler's tools.

Now, let us move for a moment to Italian Libya. Let us narrow the picture from the general to the particular. What is the attitude of the inhabitants of Libya, the Arabs, the Moslems of Libya, towards the fight that is now raging inland and along their coasts?

Well, there is a story told, I am not telling you it is fact because I do not know whether it is fact, but it is the typical story which colours the attitude of the Arabs to the Italians. It really doesn't matter whether it is fact. If I were to tell you it was, it would be propaganda. It doesn't even matter whether you and I believe it or not. What matters is that the *Arabs* firmly believe it as fact, and it colours their relations with their temporary masters, the Italians.

It is said that when the Fascist Government of Rome was engaged in subduing the peoples of Libya, they took

the chiefs of that sacred fraternity of the Senussi, whose headquarters are in the oasis of Kufra, up in airplanes to a height of 12,000 feet, and then pushed them out into space. They then sent a Senussi congregation, under military guard, to get the bodies off of the sand and bury them in a common criminal's grave. That is what the Arabs believe.

With that background, you can well understand what the attitude of the Arabs in Libya is to their recent and retreating masters. The Arabs are busying themselves about their father's business. And they are busy with it now. They are busy going about praying for the souls of those spiritual fathers of theirs, and the memory of their indecent death still holds good. That's why the Libyan Arabs are now about their fathers' business. And their search in the desert, and their "busy-ness" there, is not for charity, but for the throats of the Italians.

I should like to turn, if I may, to the other end of the Moslem Mediterranean. What of Turkey? Well, Mustafa Kemal, whom I think it is fair to call the greatest of the modern Authoritarians, is dead. But his policy, and above all his foreign policy, he bequeathed to the Turkish nation. And, until far into this war, it was that policy which held the field and regulated the relations between the Turkish nation and the British peoples.

Their foreign policy can be crystallized and summarized in one phrase. "Geography and our own position do not permit of us being found, in time of war, on the other side of the barrier from the Russians' empire (with its 170 million subjects), so long as it still hangs together." That sums up in a phrase the Turkish attitude. It is demonstrated in practice in that, when the Treaty was made between the Turks and the British peoples, there was an "escape clause" which specifically laid down that whatever happened the Turks would not be expected to employ their armies against the Russians, except in home-defence.

Well, that arises, of course, from a long series of events. It arises at the present time, and the result is the

combination that the Turkish peoples by sentiment, and the Turkish Government in enlightened self-interest, are at one.

Happily, they are united in realizing that their future interests lie in a close co-operation with the British peoples in this struggle for liberty. Of this there is no doubt, but be patient. It is not fair to expect that the Turks with 170 millions of Russians on one side, with three passes from the Caucasus down into Turkey, and knowing very well that the Russians and the Germans have agreed that all territory which was theirs respectively before the war of 1914 shall be returned to each, knowing that in 1914, before the war, the fortress of Kars was Russian, and that it now lies within Turkish territory, and therefore an excuse is there for demands to be made on Turkey. The Turks see that the Germans, from the beginning, have used the Russians as the bogeyman who beats the war drum in the back garden while the Germans march up the front garden path to break in. The Turks have observed that, when Hitler prepares his blow, the stiletto stroke, the stab-in-the-back, is dealt by Russia. The Turks have noticed how on each occasion, of which Bessarabia is a recent instance, before the Germans come in, the country is threatened by the Russians, as was Northern Scandinavia through Finland. Nation after nation, forced to choose between the two protagonists, has cried, "We don't want these bloody Oriental Bolsheviks, we should prefer, please, the orderly Germans."

If you go to Eastern Europe, to anywhere on the margin of Europe, the same phrase in one form or another, though in more refined language than mine, is put forward in excuse by politicians of all those countries, as the reason they had not instituted a common front against ultimate German aggression.

Into Bessarabia came the Russians, while the Rumanians looked around to Germany for protection against the Oriental scourge from the east. So too the Turks look apprehensively north and east to see where the lightning stroke of treachery will be dealt to them in their turn, if

the Germanic hordes should wish to push due south through Bulgaria.

Under circumstances of that kind, you cannot expect that the Turkish people, who are much less than 20 million, should send very far from home an expeditionary force to aid any other nation at a time when they may wake up any morning to find themselves fighting for their national existence on their own doorsteps. It is not reasonable to expect it. But the fact which is one of solid satisfaction is that the Turkish Government, the Turkish nation are one in preferring (if they can) to come in with the struggle of the British peoples. (Applause.)

Now, allow me at a moment of this kind to just make a short remark and in only three phrases, to summarize again what were the characteristics of that great man *Ghazi*, Mustafa Kemal. At a time like this, when all the world is looking for leadership, the essential qualities of a great leader like that cannot pass without appreciation. They may be even of value at a time when we are all looking for something of the kind all over the world. Europe, after all, has suffered from lack of leadership as much as anything else. On the continent of Europe, I think it might have been said before the war that somebody looking down on us from Mars might have felt that almost all Europe approximated, in differing degrees, to the two *types*, of Germany and of France. One side and type was brutally overled and misled. The other side was pitifully underled and bled.

The Turks have been fortunate. By their *Ghazi*, they were neither overled nor underled. The characteristics of that great man are so contradictory that at the time they almost seemed to constitute a patriotic paradox. First, he was a man who was a *practical mystic*. It is indeed a contradiction in terms. What I mean by that is this. He was a man who had vision and carried it swiftly into execution. Mustafa Kemal was a man who was a *rational fanatic*. He was a ruthless but reasoning reformer. He pitilessly pruned the neglected Ottoman tree until such

time as a rich new sap surged up to every root and branch of the Turkish nation, which he regenerated.

Mustafa Kemal again (and this is the third point of the summary) was a man of *unselfish ambition*. He harnessed his vaunting ambition to the chariot and the service of the state. And I think you will agree with me when you pick out those three phrases, and their significance, that at a time like this when we are all looking for a dynamic leadership all through Europe, that those are qualities which are worthy of a wide appreciation.

But whatever may happen in those areas of the Mediterranean we must not underestimate it, because the push down the three great pillars represents, of course, the Germanic effort to cut the long line of communications which links together the British peoples. If that line were cut it would isolate those campaigns now being carried on by Canadian, Anzac and British troops on those fronts in Greece and Libya. That long line of communications links Britain to Australia and is the front way to India, which is supplying the armies in Egypt by the back door. The enemy effort is designed to swarm down those Mediterranean pillars to cut our lines of communication in three places.

But, you know, the Suez Canal is not the real canal. You have only to look at the map,—unfortunately this map does not illustrate it all,—but the real canal, that real vital line of communication is the Grand Canal, which begins at Gibraltar and ends at Aden. It narrows down by Sicily, but that is the real Grand Canal. And not otherwise do the Moslem people regard it, for they talk of that Grand Canal which begins in Arabic Tangier and ends in Arabic Aden. That is what we are concerned with, more than with any one front which we may rightly or wrongly regard as secondary.

We still have to remember the great and final decision will be made upon the western coast of Europe where, amid the fury of bomb-spattered seas, there stands a little island like a rock upon which great breakers shatter them-

selves in vain. (Applause.) And whichever side we live of that northern ocean which shares our shores, we had all long sought peace and ensued it. We sought peace with decent security, with the decencies of life, and not without honour. When peace could not be had upon those most elementary and essential of conditions, we all of us, when we put our hands to the plow, are not of those who turn ourselves back in the day of battle. And there is more to it than that.

Whichever side we live of that wide English-speaking lake, which is the North Atlantic which unites us all who lawfully and jointly rule its waves, we are all equal heirs and successors of that great tradition of which Magna Charta and Westminster Abbey are but monumental milestones. They are only the bright beacons which, like the stars in the heavens themselves, still, amid the encircling gloom, can lead us on.

You and I, together with our great brethren across the border, are equal inheritors of that *Way of Life*, that *Way of the Spirit* for which our fathers died and for the survival of which we all, each of us under God, in our appointed place and according to our strength, are giving our best, are giving all we know in that struggle against unchained savagery of men who have reeled back into the Beast.

That Way of Life, that Way of the Democratic Spirit, that wide Way of Life, and that same Way of Arms to defend them, can give a common ground equally to those who are the oldest white *habitants* of Canada, and to those who are the newest contributors to that rich amalgam which is the Canadian nation. Whether we are old-established French-Canadians or whether we are sturdy Ukrainians who love the land, this war has shown us that we are on common ground which we are all equally and jointly determined to defend.

And so in Britain there is no weakening and no wavering. (Applause.) The Minister of Defence, in that magnificent talk last Sunday night, brought fresh

evidence and fresh testimony of it, from Britain. And in the day of battle and under the threat of calamity, Britain and all the British peoples develop a secret strength and a pulse like a cannon. So, in this our day of ordeal by fire (because that is what it is) we have to face unflinchingly the fact that fire is an element which cauterizes wounds and which purifies endeavour. We have to remember that suffering is a quality which is capable of regenerating whole nations.

So the Ministers in each of those countries of the British nations are leaving us at last—thank God!—in no doubt. They are showing themselves to be wise to devise and to be swift to execute that great policy which the hearts and minds of the overwhelming majority of mankind are demanding of you and of me, and of all the English-speaking peoples, at this very hour. (Applause.)

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON: Gentlemen, I am going to ask a fellow craftsman to say a word on our behalf. We don't know much about newspaper men and they know enough about one another that they won't give anything away. Mr. John Stevenson—of *The (London) Times*, and more recently of our *Globe and Mail*.

MR. JOHN STEVENSON: Mr. Ferguson and Gentlemen: I am going to be very brief. I don't think I am an appropriate person to be selected for this privilege. I might be apt to take a certain reflected credit from the eloquent speech that Mr. Tracy Philipps has just delivered. We are in a sense colleagues, as he has been at intervals a very valued member of the staff of the *London Times*.

I am sure you will agree that Mr. Philipps has given a most illuminating and informative picture of the condition of the Moslem world and the struggle in which we are now engaged, and he has also described the fundamental reality of that struggle in its development, in a way

such as it is rarely our lot to hear. It was certainly a most uncommon speech, and I think I am voicing the appreciation of everybody here when I say it has not only improved our knowledge of one of the most critical situations in the war but it also has given us sincere and unfeigned pleasure. (Applause.)

"INFLATION AND WAR FINANCE"

AN ADDRESS BY

F. CYRIL JAMES, B.COM., M.A., PH.D.

PRINCIPAL OF MCGILL UNIVERSITY.

Chairman: The President, The Honourable G. Howard Ferguson.

Thursday, February 6, 1941

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON: Gentlemen, before we come to the regular business of the meeting I would like to ask Mr. Wilkinson to speak to us for a few moments on the War Savings Campaign.

MR. ELLIS H. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen: I feel it is rather an imposition that you should be asked to listen to these remarks, for most of you are so much more familiar with matters of finance than I am. Still the Chairman has asked me and I must obey. Ten minutes was first suggested as the period of my talk, but a friend later told me that three minutes would be ample, and three minutes it is.

May I suggest that we should think of the campaign from three angles? Firstly, the social angle. We all realize that at the conclusion of the war there is bound to be a tremendous social readjustment. If everybody can put by money through the purchase of savings certificates the result will be a very valuable back-log of cash to help through the period of readjustment. Secondly, from the social angle may I suggest that the developmen of thrift is a vital help to a country at any time and particularly so in time of war. Even though the population of Canada

has a large proportion of people of Scottish ancestry there is no reason why we should not endeavour to develop their natural thrift to an even greater extent.

And that reminds me of a story which has just come from Edinburgh about the War Savings Campaign in that city. A woman brought along 10 £ to buy certificates and announced: "I have been saving up for some time to get a divorce from my husband but I think I can put up with him better than I can with Hitler, so please go and smash Hitler!" I am not suggesting that any of you are saving up with any such object in view, but undoubtedly many of us have expenditures that could be avoided and the money could be devoted to winning the war. As to the financial angle I can say absolutely nothing with intelligence because I know nothing about finance, but I would suggest that we consider the tremendous results that have been achieved in the Old Country in their War Savings Campaign. They have set an objective—and achieved it—of \$55,000,000 a month. Australia for the past few months has been saving at the rate of \$10,000,000 a month, and that is our objective here.

It was suggested to me that one should put a very strong patriotic appeal into a speech of this kind, but in my opinion such an attempt would only be an insult to members of the Empire Club, for we all know from week to week what members of this club are doing. I wonder how many of us have read *The White Cliffs*. Those of us who have, have probably found many parts of it provocative and annoying at times. The writer was an American gaining experiences of England and I would like to quote a couple of lines from the last chapter:

"If England should perish and fall,
In this world I do not care to live."

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON: It is a rather unusual pleasure for one to introduce to this gathering one of our neighbours, Dr. James, head of McGill University, who is so widely known for his educational work in Canada. Dr. James has had rather a

unique and remarkable career. An Englishman by birth, he is a graduate of London University and is one of those fortunate educators who has added much to the prestige of his country. He captured the Castle Fellowship which gave him the right to travel and study economic conditions. He came to America and at the University of Pennsylvania studied the economic structure of the United States. In the fall of 1939 he came to McGill as Director of the School of Commerce and Professor of Economics, and had been there only two months when he was appointed Principal of that great institution. Since that time his career has shown evidence not only of popularity, but of exceptional ability as an educator. Gentlemen, I have very great pleasure in introducing Dr. James, Principal of McGill University.

F. CYRIL JAMES, B.COM., M.A., PH.D.: Mr. Chairman, President Cody, Members of the Empire Club of Toronto: I searched around for some time, when I was invited to come here, to find a subject on which to speak to you. It seemed to me that at the present moment, when we have a Savings Campaign across the entire country, and at a time when some individuals, often more numerous than those whose names appear in the press, have been suggesting that only by an inflationary policy can we finance the war satisfactorily, that I should point out the dangers of such a policy and give some of the experiences that some other nations have had with these policies.

Those of us who have observed carefully the march of events in the past twenty-five years must catch a sardonic note to-day in the demands that are being made for an inflationary policy in Canada to finance the war. The words bring back haunting memories of the speeches that were made in the United States during those fabulous years of the "New Era" when unbridled expansion of bank deposits was building the fantastic house of cards that collapsed with such a resounding crash between 1929 and 1933. We have experienced the effects of that infla-

tion at first hand but we have not yet plumbed the depths of the penalty that mankind must pay for that debauch. If there had been no inflation in the United States—inflation that facilitated the foreign loans that made it possible for the world to postpone a satisfactory settlement of the German reparation problem—Hitler might never have risen to power. If Germany herself had managed to avoid the inflationary spree of 1921 to 1923, Hitler might have had no Nazi followers to support him—for it was that ordeal that wrecked the economic machinery of the defeated nation and weakened the soul of its people.

How could men believe in the national honour of Germany when the mark was the laughing stock of the world, or have confidence in social justice when fortunes evaporated overnight? Dr. Schacht, who should have known the facts, tells us that at the peak of the inflation there were engaged on the production of notes for the Reichsbank, one hundred and thirty-three printing offices and seventeen hundred and eighty-three machines. Over thirty paper factories were working full time exclusively for the Reichsbank. How could a stable economic order be built on such a foundation?

Let me offer you a very simple example of how the inflationary process might have worked in a hypothetical case. Last year the total national income of the Dominion of Canada was about \$4,650,000,000. Now let us suppose that in 1919, when the dollar was worth about ten marks, a man with a fortune of ten times that sum had invested the whole amount, as he might easily have done, in first class German securities. If that man at the end of 1923 had brought back to Canada all his investments he would have been offered for the lot one Canadian \$10 bill.

Men who observed the nightmarish scenes of 1923 in Berlin, and of 1933 in Washington, do not talk lightly of inflation. They saw the pillars of society pulled down by an unseen Samson and watched the victims crawling painfully from the ruins. Some of them indeed cherish the memories of those who did not ultimately escape.

There is nothing new about the evils of inflation. This is not the only generation to which they have been revealed. I would like to read you a quotation from Andrew Jackson White about what happened in the French Revolution. White was a professor of History, President of Cornell and later Ambassador of the United States to Germany. He wrote a century after the events so that the heat of passion had cooled and reason held sway. Nevertheless his indictment is one that none of us would wish to see recorded as the epitaph of our generation. He wrote:

“Prices of the necessities of life increased: merchants were obliged to increase them, not only to cover depreciation of their merchandise, but also to cover their risk of loss from fluctuation; and while the prices of products thus rose, wages, which had at first gone up under the general stimulus, lagged behind. Under the universal doubt and discouragement, commerce and manufactures were checked or destroyed. As a consequence the demand for labour was diminished; labouring men were thrown out of employment, and, under the operation of the simplest law of supply and demand, the price of labour—the daily wages of the labouring class—went down until, at a time when prices of food, clothing and various articles of consumption were enormous, wages were nearly as low as at the time preceding the first issue of irredeemable currency.

“The mercantile classes at first thought themselves exempt from the general misfortune. They were delighted at the apparent advance in the value of the goods upon their shelves. But they soon found that, as they increased prices to cover the inflation of currency and the risk from fluctuation and uncertainty, purchases became less in amount and payments less sure; a feeling of insecurity spread throughout the country; enterprise was deadened and stagnation followed.

“New issues of paper were then clamored for as more drams are demanded by a drunkard. New issues only increased the evil; capitalists were all the more

reluctant to embark their money on such a sea of doubt. Workmen of all sorts were more and more thrown out of employment. Issue after issue of currency came; but no relief resulted save a monetary stimulus, which aggravated the disease. The most ingenious evasions of the natural laws of finance which the most subtle theorists could contrive were tried—all in vain. . . . All thoughtful men had lost confidence. All men were waiting; stagnation became worse and worse. At last came the collapse, . . . the complete financial, moral and political prostration of France—a prostration from which only Napoleon could raise it.”

We do not, however, have to stop at the French Revolution if we belong to that group of men who refuse to admit that the only lesson of history is that mankind never learns from it. John Law created the prosperity of the Mississippi Bubble in France and solemnly made himself the Duke of Arkansas to celebrate the prosperity that his bank had brought, as well as his own almost regal importance. Within five years the collapse of the Bubble had plunged France into the Slough of economic and moral Despond that bred the Revolution, and Law died, a homeless beggar in Venice.

There are hundreds of such examples in history, but I will content myself with one, the earliest of them all. I speak of King Solomon. His wisdom has become a by-word to the ends of the earth. He would have understood very clearly the ideas of those who want the government to augment our economic effort by monetary inflation. When he came to the throne of Israel he found his country very poor from an economic standpoint and suffering from the effects of foreign wars. Having built up his defences and adopted a peaceful foreign policy, he set out to improve the economic position of his people by a huge programme of public works. He built the House of the Lord, a magnificent structure that took seven years to complete, and his own house, which took thirteen years, and the house in the forest of Lebanon. But that was not

the whole of his programme, for Solomon also built "Millo, and the Wall of Jerusalem, and Hazor, and Megiddo and Gezer" together with "Beth-Horon the nether, and Baalath, and Tadmor in the wilderness . . . and all the cities of store that Solomon had, and cities for his chariots, and cities for his horsemen, and that which Solomon desired to build in Jerusalem, and in Lebanon, and in all the land of his dominion." In other words, Solomon, as the Bible informs us, not only spent money lavishly on defence but also set out to make a large number of long-range improvements in his capital.

As I have already pointed out, however, Israel at this period was comparatively poor. Where then, did the money come from to finance such a programme? Some, no doubt from taxation, some from the gold mines of Ophir, but most of it came from Hiram, King of Tyre. He it was who "furnished Solomon with cedar trees and fir trees and with gold according to his desire," contributions that were obviously inflationary in an age when the currency was gold and silver that rang on the counter. The Bible does not concern itself with such mundane things as prices and wages, but we do gather that there was very little unemployment during Solomon's reign. Skilled labourers had to be brought in from Tyre and Sidon. We may assume, too, that prices were high, and got steadily higher, for we are told that silver had so decreased in value that it was as common as stones in Jerusalem.

Israel prospered, and men came from far and wide to observe and admire the wisdom of Solomon. Somehow the account of these visits reminds us of the many foreign delegations and committees who came to the United States during the years of the inflationary bubble to learn the secret of American prosperity, though none of them was perhaps so glamorous as the Queen of Sheba, who was attracted to Jerusalem in the hope of learning something from that wizard of finance, King Solomon.

But there was an aftermath to these policies which we

should do well to remember, lest we fall into the popular error of imagining that an inflationary increase in government spending is the key to prosperity and maximum output. Solomon, happily for his memory, "died at the appropriate time—a recipe for immortality that should be studied by all who wish to remain great—and Rehoboam reigned in his stead. By that time people were getting a little restive under the high taxes necessitated by the commitments on Solomon's loans. Prices were no longer rising: it would probably be correct to assume that they had started to go down. To Rehoboam, then, came delegations demanding greater economy in government and reduction of taxation. But the King took counsel with his young men—they would have been called his "Brain Trust" in the United States—who liked the ways of royal extravagance and advised him to keep on with the good work. It was pleasant advice, and Rehoboam told the delegation: "My little finger shall be thicker than my father's loins, and now, whereas my father did lade you with a heavy yoke, I will add to your yoke." That is the picturesque phraseology of an Oriental, but what it really meant was that not only would the income tax remain at the same rate, but a new super-tax would be added.

There is no need to study the details of the young King's reign. Nobody has written of the glory or wisdom of Rehoboam, for it was a reign of falling prices and high taxation—conditions that ultimately led to civil war and divided the Kingdom against itself. It was then that the ten tribes were lost; but that is all done with now for British Israel seems to have found them again.

And yet, with all this past record for our guidance, there still remain people who want the government to adopt inflationary policies, for the inflationists, like the poor, are always with us. Why? The answer is simple. Inflation is not a nauseous poison that frightens those who look on it: it is a seductive drug which, like opium, destroys its victims more effectively because it offers initial pleasure and inspires a taste for ever larger doses.

I will not attempt a precise scientific definition of the term "inflation" but I think we may take it to mean all those monetary policies which, usually by an expansion in the supply of money, attempt to increase prices or to keep them from falling in a period of declining cost of production. It is not the supply of money that is important, but the price system. In any economic society, save at moments of acute crisis or disturbance, the existing supply of money is always adequate to handle any volume of business, since price is the mechanism that automatically adjusts these two quantities. It is not an increased supply of money within the country that the inflationists desire, but the effects that they expect that increase to produce on prices and output.

A monetary stimulus, however, can only influence production through the mechanism of price, and the significant fact to remember is that individual prices react differently to the stimulus of inflation. If a doubling of the supply of money doubled all prices—including wages, rents and interest payments—there would be no inflationists. Everybody would have twice as many counters in his pockets, but he would be no better off in terms of the things he desired than he had been before the inflation occurred. The desire for inflation is born of the fact that it provides *some* people with increased quantities of money while the rest have no more than previously, and the stimulus that inflation gives to productive activity arises out of the fact that some prices rise more rapidly than others. These facts are equally true, no matter how inflation comes about. In the United States, from 1923 to 1929, inflation arose from bank deposit expansion resulting from increased business borrowing. It was the entrepreneurs, in this case, who enjoyed the initial advantage resulting from increased quantities of money, and the inflationary stimulus was first felt in the capital-goods industry. During the last world war, when inflation occurred in each of the belligerent countries, it was the government that obtained increased funds from either the banks or the

printing-presses, and the munitions industry that felt the inflationary stimulus when these funds were spent.

I have not time, to-day, to analyse in detail all the effects of an inflationary policy upon each member of the community, but I would, however, like to draw some broad outlines.

Because of what economists call the varying "elasticity" of different prices, it is broadly true that during an inflationary period raw material prices rise first and farthest; wholesale prices are almost as much affected, and retail prices lag considerably behind. Even in these days of active trades unions and collective wage agreements, wage rates tend to rise much less rapidly than retail prices, while rents and interest rates are the slowest of all prices in their movement. In the light of this dispersion it is obvious that the industrialist and the producer of raw materials will tend to make increased profits while monetary inflation is forcing prices upwards. The prices at which they sell their products will rise very much more rapidly than the aggregate of the costs of production that each must pay. Speculators, too, will make fortunes since the articles in which they deal will increase in price with every passing day, and all the debtors of the community will reap advantage from the fact that they can obtain the dollars with which to pay their obligations through the sacrifice of a steadily diminishing quantity of real goods and services.

But, to make up for all these gains, someone must be the loser. Inflation does not necessarily increase the aggregate national income available for distribution amongst the members of the community. The chief losers, of course, are the working class and the creditor class. The wage earner finds that his standard of living is steadily depressed because his income increases much more slowly than the prices of the things he customarily purchases. The creditor is deprived of the substance because the dollars he receives when the loan is paid will purchase less of the necessities and comforts of life than they did when

the loan was made. It should be remembered, too, that the creditor class, in a modern community, does not consist of the bloated plutocrats, with distended stomachs and gold watch chains as big as ships' anchors across their vests, who figured so largely in the biting cartoons with which Nast adorned the inflationary controversy that racked the United States in the 1890's. The great creditor institutions of to-day are the savings banks and insurance companies, to which have been entrusted the funds of millions of ordinary men and women; the universities; educational endowments and charitable organizations, whose funds have been invested in bonds. When these groups suffer loss it is the community at large, and particularly the poorer members of the community, who suffer.

Perhaps I should reiterate the fact, already briefly mentioned, that the price dispersion which makes inflation attractive to those who expect to reap advantages from it is operative only while the supply of money is increasing. A pipe of opium does not make a man happy for the rest of his life. A single increase in the supply of money does not create prosperity for eternity. It merely sets in motion the forces that redistribute the national income along the lines I have mentioned. When the supply of money stops increasing, the upward spiral ceases and financial crisis descends with the nemesis of liquidation in its train. The United States learned that fact painfully between 1929 and 1933. It is for this reason that all inflations in history have ended so disastrously. Successive doses of money, continuously increasing in size, are necessary to keep the wheels of industry whirling feverishly until the point is reached at which money has lost its charm because men no longer believe in its value. At that point we descend into the abyss of industrial collapse.

It may be suggested, however, that, even if all this be true, inflation is still necessary to-day. War demands strong measures, and it may be that a tot of rum is necessary for the man in the trenches even though there be some danger that it may encourage deplorable alcoholic habits. Is it true that, even at the risk of ultimate collapse, Canada

is compelled to resort to inflation in order that she may put forth her maximum effort in the struggle?

Looking at the war coolly and without emotion, it is obvious that the problem of financing it is simply that of finding practical means by which the government can extract from the total national income of goods and services an amount sufficient to provide the guns and shells and ships that it needs, as well as food and clothing for its troops. If the total national output of goods and services can be increased in the process, so much the better; but, at all costs, the government must obtain the quantity of munitions and foodstuffs that it needs for the war effort. In theory, the best and simplest way to attack the problem would be by the direct conscription of wealth. The government would nationalize the whole productive machinery of the country and arbitrarily decide what things should be produced, as well as what proportion of total production should be devoted to government (as distinct from private) uses. This, in fact, is what Germany has done under her elaborate system of economic controls, but such an approach is not appropriate to a democratic country. Our government is not organized to run Canadian factories and farms, and we may well doubt that government appointees, appointed hurriedly on the spur of the moment, could run them as well as the farmers and industrialists who have learned wisdom from a lifetime of experience. Such a policy, therefore, might tend to exacerbate the problem by reducing the real national income.

The second method, more appropriate to a democratic country, is that of taxation. The government may not operate factories of its own but, by imposing taxes on all members of the community, it will, at one and the same time, reduce their power to consume and provide itself with the funds necessary to purchase in the market all the munitions and foodstuffs it needs. If one quarter of the output of Canadian farms and factories is needed for the prosecution of the war, the government can take one quarter of the aggregate money income from Canadians as a group and use this revenue for purchasing the goods it

needs. Naturally, some reorganization of factories would be necessary. We should need more shells and tanks and corvettes, fewer refrigerators and pleasure yachts; but the change over from one product to another would be made by business enterprises themselves under the stimulus of contracts and expected profits.

Pushed to its logical conclusion this form of war finance is as precise as the conscription of wealth I have already referred to, but it is very hard to push the matter to a completely logical conclusion because there is no perfect criterion of the incidence of taxation. No matter how well the government may work out the scheme under which taxes are imposed it is always certain that the taxes will bear more heavily upon some members of the community than upon others, so that, in actual practice the government tends to raise, by taxation, rather less than the total purchasing power it needs for the effort, relying upon the purchase of war bonds and war savings certificates by the public to make up the difference. Such bonds and certificates are purchased by those members of the community who still have a slight surplus left after taxes are paid and reasonable costs of living are provided for, while the total government revenues from taxes and loans provide it with the power to obtain an appropriate portion of the aggregate national output.

When it is impossible for a government to obtain, by any of these means, control over an adequate portion of the total national output, inflation becomes necessary. The form it takes is unimportant. Dionysius of Syracuse halved the metallic content of the silver coins in his treasury and thereby doubled the purchasing power of his resources. France, in the last war, printed vast quantities of bank notes which were placed at the disposal of the government. The British government sold bonds to the banks, which purchased them by newly created bank deposits. In each case the result was the same. The government obtained increased quantities of money without any reduction in the sums possessed by individual members of the community, so that prices were bound to rise as the re-

sult of the competitive spending by governments and private individuals. That rise in prices restricted the power of the average individual to consume, and so freed goods and services for the government war effort.

Frankly, however, we must admit that the whole process was nothing but self-deception and, as a matter of fact, during the last war, each of the governments protested violently that no inflation was occurring. In those gentler days it was still believed that the art of deception depended upon the power to deceive, whereas, to-day, we have reached that stage of mental weakness in which some people openly suggest that the government should deceive us in order to save us, temporarily, from the unpleasant pangs associated with the paying of taxes. In the long run we should be no better off as a result of this co-operative deception, since our individual standards of living would be as ruthlessly cut by the price increase resulting from inflation as by the heavier direct taxation. Thus, the only valid argument for inflation in Canada to-day would seem to be a frank admission that the people of this Dominion are not sufficiently interested in the results of the war to pay, honestly and directly, the taxes that are necessary for its successful prosecution. No one of us, I think, would dare to make that allegation.

Many people, though admitting the truth of this analysis, will still insist, however, that during the early days of a war some inflation is necessary in order to facilitate the mobilization of the nation's economic resources. It is not easy, overnight, for a government to develop appropriate legislation for the collecting of heavy taxes, so that some funds are needed to finance the war before increased tax revenues can be obtained. Moreover, the reorganization of the nation's productive facilities, so that factories, which normally produce consumer goods, can switch over to war activity, usually involves some delay and expenditure, so that, once again, substantial amounts of money may be necessary during the early months of any war.

This argument may be admitted, but it is spacious and

does not apply to Canada at the present time. We have already experienced the initial inflation that was necessary to get the war effort under way, since the total supply of money in Canada (notes in circulation plus total deposits of the chartered banks) is already 16 per cent above the average level for 1938. The wholesale price of manufactures, during the same period has increased 15 per cent, and, as we should expect, the increase in the cost of living amounts to only about one half of this figure. Parenthetically, it may be pointed out that much the same thing has happened in England where the total supply of money (current accounts of London Clearing Banks plus currency in circulation) has increased by 30 per cent, while the wholesale prices of manufactured goods are more than 40 per cent above the level of 1938. The cost of living in Great Britain has gone up about 20 per cent, and the increase in weekly wages is very nearly as great—roughly, 18 per cent.

The present situation, therefore, is not one that calls for a little inflation to stimulate Canada's war effort, but one in which a small dose of inflation has already been injected into the economic system, so that we may be careful not to increase the dose and develop the drug habit. If we are to save ourselves from the ghastly experiences of post-war deflation comparable to those from which the world suffered after 1920, we must take thought now and rigorously decide on the fiscal policies that we wish to follow. Even in the case of the United States, which is not actively engaged in the struggle, there has already been a 15 per cent increase in the total supply of money, and Professor Irving Fisher has recently pointed out the necessity of taking stock of the whole situation if further inflation is to be avoided. The seriousness of Canada's position in this matter cannot be over-emphasized. If the world is to achieve a satisfactory international monetary system at the end of this war we must obviously build the foundations now by avoiding further monetary inflation in each of the important countries I have mentioned.

Some of you may say that throughout this analysis I have made no reference to the doctrines with which the name of John Maynard Keynes is invariably associated. The omission, up to this point, has been deliberate, because the arguments of Mr. Keynes' school of thinkers apply specifically to periods of business depression and are intended to accelerate recovery from conditions approaching stagnation. It was for this reason that so much was heard of them during the years from 1931 to 1935.

The broad lines of the Keynesian theory are these: In times of depression there are large numbers of skilled men out of work, factories idle and large stores of raw materials piling up largely because fear of one kind or another has inspired those individuals who still possess resources to restrict the volume of their spending. Funds are hoarded and not invested, so that the diminution in the demand for consumer goods is not compensated by any increase in the demand for producer goods. Moreover, at such a time it would be unreasonable to expect the investment of any large sums in new capital equipment, because the stagnation of the market, which has already reduced existing factories to idleness, offers little prospect that new factories could operate profitably, even if they were built. In modern communities such a state of affairs involves the government in substantial payments for the relief of those who are unemployed, but, if funds for this purpose are raised by increased taxation, there is a tendency to reduce further the consuming powers of those members of the population who still enjoy incomes. It is suggested, therefore, that the government should either print or borrow from the banks sufficient funds to pay unemployment allowances that will augment the total consumption of the community. Such augmentation of consumption, we are told, would encourage expanding production, increase employment, bring farmers and factories into operation again. It will not, however, increase prices, since the total output of goods will increase much more rapidly than the supply of funds, and the

initial loan can soon be repaid out of the increased revenues from taxation.

So bald an outline does less than justice to the brilliant writings of Mr. Keynes, but it will serve our present purpose. I shall not even attempt to analyze its theoretical points of strength and weakness in respect to the conditions to which it is intended to apply, because the significant point for our purpose is that these conditions do not apply in Canada at the present time. The Keynesian theory, even if it be accepted wholeheartedly, applies only to periods of acute depression in which large numbers of efficient factories are idle and many employable men out of work. I do not see any evidence that such a state of affairs exists in any part of Canada to-day. The volume of employment is already some 16 per cent above the average for 1929, and the physical volume of production has increased by about a third since 1938. Our factories are working pretty close to capacity, and in many lines there is already a shortage of skilled labour. Naturally there are still some idle plants, but careful observation will usually reveal that these are obsolete, and that it would be cheaper, in the long run, to build new factories than to recondition them. Similarly there are still men and women unemployed, and all of us hope sincerely that tasks will soon be found for them in the expanding Canadian economy. These people, however, in almost all cases, are unskilled workers or those unfitted in some way for the special activities that war demands. No amount of inflation will turn the unskilled labourer into a tool maker or an expert machinist, and the problem here is one of training and aptitude rather than a by-product of a supply of money.

Unless it can be shown that large reservoirs of skilled labour and efficient capital facilities are at present unused, it is impossible to invoke the Keynesian argument for inflation, and even if such evidence were found, it does not seem apparent that that augmented production would be achieved more easily by inflation than by more legitimate fiscal policies.

To summarize, then, there is, so far as I can see, no valid argument which would justify resort to inflation in Canada at the present time. Our productive facilities are being rapidly brought into full utilization, and there is every evidence that the population is wholeheartedly behind the war effort. It should not be assumed, however, that this statement implies that Canada is already doing all that she can. The available evidence suggests that the people of Great Britain are working harder and sacrificing more of their goods to the common effort than we on this side of the Atlantic. Even in 1938 the per capita taxes of Great Britain amounted to \$107.80 as against the Canadian burden—Dominion, provincial and local—of \$78.76, and there is no evidence to show that this differential has been wiped out in the past year.

As has been stated on many occasions, Canada and the United States constitute the arsenal of democracy which must supply ever-increasing quantities of food and munitions to the men and women who are manning the front line in Britain to-day. Every Canadian is called upon to exert his greatest effort and to pool the maximum amount of his personal resources in order that we may prove worthy to be counted comrades of those who are at present bearing the burden of the struggle. Nay, more than that, Canada is developing rapidly during this war. She is called upon to play a more important part in world affairs than at any previous time in history, and I can foresee that, if she assumes her burden with efficiency and enthusiasm, she will, at the end of the war, have attained greater economic wealth and enhanced prestige. These things will not be achieved by self-deception, and we should be gambling with destiny and our childrens' happiness if we sold the priceless future for a devil's mess of potage. Inflation is not only unnecessary to-day: resort to it would be the bewildered confession of weakness from that member of the British Commonwealth of Nations to which the Mother Country—in common with the rest of the world—to-day looks for a special measure of strength and support.

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON: I would ask Dr. Cody to say on your behalf a few words of appreciation to Dr. James for his address. He hesitates to do so, but as one eminent educationist to another I think it is important that he should.

DR. H. L. CODY: Mr. Chairman, Dr. James and Gentlemen: Any hesitation I may have is due to the fact that I have just got out of bed after an attack of 'flu and have not yet quite regained my vocal powers. But it does give me very great pleasure to voice your thanks and deep appreciation of what Principal James has so admirably and lucidly placed before us. He has thoroughly emphasized the vital necessity for careful thinking on these all-important questions. He has shown us the real issues involved, how inflation may seem very alluring and how it may lead to destruction. He has challenged us to let no such thoughts enter our minds until we have exhausted all our ability to sacrifice and to give. That, we have not yet done. And I trust Canada, nay I believe Canada will come out of this great struggle secure and strong, because we have given to the Empire's cause to the limit of our thought, service, life and treasure.

May I venture one word of a personal nature—two words? One is, may I recall to your memories the exceeding appropriateness of illustrations from the old Bible. There is nothing under the sun that turns up in our modern days that has not some reminder of it in the ever-living Book. The other day at a children's service the rector spoke from a text in the Proverbs of Solomon. He asked the children who was the wisest man. One youngster answered that he was Solomon. The rector asked why, and another boy—one I know well, for I christened him—rose and answered: "Because he had three hundred wives." One of the newspapers reporting this service commented that anyway Solomon had plenty of advice.

The other word is this: I thank you, sir, for giving me the privilege of saying a word of warm welcome to my fellow college head from McGill. Perhaps you do not

know—the fact is only to be found in histories of education—that the real founder of McGill and Toronto Universities was one and the same person—John Strachan. It was John Strachan who married the widow of Andrew McGill and who persuaded James McGill that he could dispose of his money in no better way than by founding an institution of higher learning. It was the same John Strachan, then Archdeacon of Toronto, who went to England in 1827 and obtained the Charter for the establishment of King's College—the forerunner of Toronto University. But it is not only because of past history, nor because of the kindly relations that have ever existed between the two universities, that I welcome Dr. James. It is also because his great institution, along with other universities, is doing so much in these great days to educate the young men of this dominion to do the highly skilled tasks of war. It is for all those reasons that it is an especial pleasure to welcome Dr. James to-day and to express to him the hearty thanks of this great gathering.

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON: I would like to add my own word of appreciation for the great kindness of Dr. James in coming here to-day. The meeting is adjourned.

“INDO-CHINA AND THE JAPANESE”

AN ADDRESS BY

DR. JACQUES M. MAY.

Chairman: The President, The Honourable G. Howard Ferguson.

Thursday, February 13, 1941

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON: Gentlemen, we have had over a period of time a number of very interesting talks, not only interesting but very informative, about present conditions in various parts of the world. We have learned a good deal about the European situation, France, the Low Countries, particularly England, Africa and the Near East, and as a member of this Club said to me, before coming in here a while ago, the only two places we can't learn much about are Canada and the Far East.

Now, you will have plenty of time and ample opportunity to investigate and hear all you can about what we are doing in Canada, but to-day we are to have the privilege of having a unique type of discussion by Dr. May with regard to the Indo-China situation. Some of you, I dare say, have been over there. Others of you have read a good deal because it is not only an interesting feature of the whole problem but it may loom larger in importance as time goes on.

If I may venture a personal reference I was telling Dr. May a little while ago I had an opportunity to go to Bangkok, some years ago, and my wife and I were waiting at a junction for a little train, and a fellow came up to me. He was a neat, tidy, athletic type, but he was lame. They don't see many people at this lonely spot and he got into a conversation with me, and he said, "You are from America?" I said, "Yes."

He said, "I know New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, and so on". I said, "I am from Canada." He said, "Toronto?" I said, "Yes". He said, "Do you know Shea's Theatre?" I said, "Yes". He said, "Do you know Jerry Shea?", and then he went on to tell me that at one time he had put on an act of an athletic type and he had been in Toronto a number of times but unfortunately he had met with a mishap that had injured him so he couldn't continue his work.

It just shows how channels of communication and contact can be established. I don't know that Dr. May is going to tell us of anything of that kind, but I am sure he will tell us something that will be most interesting to us and that will shed an entirely new light upon a very critical and very important situation that exists in the Far East and which is, I am afraid, gradually developing into more serious proportions. Dr. May. (Applause.)

DR. JACQUES M. MAY: Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen: It looks as if the fall of France which has opened in Europe the gates of the invaders has opened them also in the Far East. Indo-China as a whole comprises two countries. On the western side is the Kingdom of Siam, an independent Kingdom; and on the eastern side are the five provinces united under French guidance. That is, it was such when I left.

During these past years Japan has sought to gain influence in those two countries—in Siam in peace time, and in French Indo-China since the fall of France—about the same way that Germany in peace time invaded the Rhineland and in war time the Low Countries, in order to secure bases on the French side of the English Channel. In the same way did the Japanese, little by little, very thoroughly indeed, as it actually appears, seek bases for themselves on the French side of the Malayan Channel.

We must have this in mind when we think of the past events in the Far East, in order to understand the coming events. They had, actually, invasion bases on the Indo-

China side against British Malaya, as Germany had on the French side of the Channel.

I don't know how much you know about French Siam and Indo-China. It is a little embarrassing to me, I am afraid, to say things you may know very well—perhaps better than I do. On the other hand, this question seems very important now, and you will certainly forgive me if I tell you things you know quite well already about the background of the present situation.

Siam is located at the western side of the Indo-China Peninsula. It is populated by around fifteen million people who claim to be of Thai descent, the word "Thai" meaning in their language "Free men". The Thai race is supposed to be an old Indian race, very much intermixed with other races, although they don't admit it, and widely scattered in the southern part of Asia. You can find Thai people in Siam, in Burma in the British Empire, you can find them in the south of China and you can find some others in French Indo-China.

In Siam you have also a Chinese community. This Chinese community is entirely devoted to trade in every part of the world and they bring a very important income to Siam by their activities in their trade. The Siamese population is chiefly agricultural, peaceful, calm, religious and quiet. They are very good people, indeed. They don't know anything about labour. They are very happy since they have plenty of rice and when they want some meat or flesh they just get a little fish out of the canals which they have quite handy, near the premises of their houses.

The happy Siamese nation was torn by bloodless revolution in 1932. The Royal Family has been since that time deprived of all the privileges that belonged to it, retaining only the right to supply the country with a Sovereign. This Sovereign is actually not of age and is completing his education in Switzerland or somewhere in Europe, and the Government of Siam has been in the hands of a political clique since 1932. This clique itself, as often in Asia and in Europe, is divided into two rival

clans. One of them, the civilian clan, is led by a man called Luang Pradit (and this leader was educated in France—much to my sorrow), and the other one, the military clan, is led by a man, also educated in France, called Luang Bipul. (I can't help it.) This man is actually the leader of these two dictators because he chose to be on the side of the Army and he owns the guns. The recent political history of Siam is nothing else but the story of the rivalry of these two clans, each of them seeking prestige and trying to gain prestige in the eyes of their respective followers.

Now, the Army in Siam is a rather good Army. It is built and equipped with the following weapons and is built on the Swiss model. To give you an idea of what this army, when it is left alone, could do, I will tell you a small personal story about it.

In 1933, the King of Siam, being very much worried about the fact that the family had been deprived of the privileges it had before the revolution, tried to make a counter-revolution, and a cousin of his started an uprising in Siam. The Army of this cousin of the King of Siam, crossed the Indo-Chinese borders from France and tried to besiege Bangkok, the capital. One evening I was taking an evening walk on the outskirts of the city and I ran into a battery firing and shooting up in the darkness. I asked the Commanding Officer, "What are you doing there?" He said, "I am shootitng at the enemy." I said, "Yes, but where is the enemy?" He said, "Well, of course we don't know—somewhere there." Of course it didn't matter very much because the cartridges for the guns did not fit the barrels.

The Navy was built on the same pattern at the time. The next day I took a morning walk, this time on the banks of the river. The Navy at that time was located on the upper river and had to go under a draw-bridge to make for the sea. The Navy was against the Government and it would have been an easy job to keep the Navy located at its anchorage in the upper part of the river by simply closing the bridge, and it was much to the interest

of the government not to let the Navy loose on the high seas.

Much to my surprise that morning the two sides of the draw-bridge were lifted and the passage was wide open so I asked an officer of the Army who happened to be there, "How is it you are allowing your rival, the Navy, to get off its anchorage?" He said that they were very much worried about that, but "There is nothing we can do. We have lost the key of the cabin where the electrical machinery is located."

Well, I can't help thinking of these two anecdotes of incidents that took place about seven years ago, when I read in the paper to-day that the Siamese Army has gained an overwhelming victory over the French forces and when I read in the paper that the Siamese Navy has sustained victoriously the fire of the French cruisers. Something must have happened.

The Air Force of Siam, since the time of 1933-1936 has been steadily increased. They have bought good machines in America, and I suppose they have, actually, around two hundred and fifty of them. Were they flown by good pilots they might have a real military value. At the time I was there and even when I left Siam in 1935 (I had been in Indo-China ever since, of course) they had no such pilots and they had no mechanics, and if a plane crashed or was damaged they simply could not repair it. How is it that we hear to-day exactly the same stories of the Army and Navy and that there is a really strong Siamese Air Force? Something must have happened.

Well, besides these military problems, what are the features of the Kingdom of Siam? Finally, the Siamese depend entirely upon the British Empire. The currency is based on the sterling and is very closely linked with the sterling bloc. They have in Bangkok a British financial adviser whose salary they pay. Besides, the exports of Siamese rice go to the Singapore market, and it would be certainly easy for the Straits Settlement Government to put a tax that might choke the Siamese economy. All this

means that certainly the British have something to say in Siamese politics and they have the means to bring strong pressure to bear upon the Siamese.

What have been the relations between Siam and Indo-China, since we see to-day in the paper there has been a war. Well, it is interesting to see what a Chinese columnist says about it. I read the letter of a Chinese scholar, written from the Province of Cambodia which had been utterly devastated by the last Siamese war. The letter is dated 1296, and the man who wrote it was a very fine Chinese scholar by the name of Tcheon Ta Rouan. It proves that these border incidents between Siam and French Indo-China are not recent—they are old. Tcheon Ta Rouan did not know, of course, what was going to happen the year after he left Cambodia, where he had been so happy. The magnificent place of Bangkok, where he had lived and which he had written about in such enthusiastic terms, was raided year after year, and within sixty of seventy years of his voyage to Cambodia, the place was entirely destroyed and covered, little by little, by the jungle, until in 1859 a French scientist discovered it again by chance.

In more recent days the French got control of Cochin-China. On the eastern side of the Chinese border the Cambodian Kingdom was still alive between the two countries, Siam on the west and Cochin-China on the east. When the French arrived there it was the yearly habit of the King of Cambodia to pay tribute to both neighbours, to be on the safe side. When the French inherited those rights they said they didn't want the Cambodian money but just the reverse, they suggested they give money to the King of Cambodia to civilize the country. After two years of peaceful negotiation the King of Siam adopted these views and recognized the French.

About twenty years later the French settled themselves in Tonking by the same ways and means, and between Tonking and Siam, in another small kingdom called the Mekong valley, a similar dispute arose, as both the Siamese and the Annamite king claimed feudal right in this area.

In the year 1904, the Siamese decided to make a real and loyal effort to find what the actual boundary line was between the two countries—not only the diplomatic one on the map. They appointed a Commission of both Siamese and French members to find out. This Commission worked for three years in the field and reached an agreement embodied in the treaty of 1907, by which an eternal line of demarcation was settled under no military pressure whatsoever but under the arbitration of an American scholar, Professor Strobel from Harvard, who at the time was Adviser on Foreign Affairs to the King of Siam. The 1907 treaty was so fair that he urged that the Siamese King should sign it.

I dare say very few treaties in the world's history have been so carefully worked upon as this 1907 treaty between France and Siam, and in fact, up to 1940, no major dispute arose between France and Siam concerning boundary questions or any question, for that matter. It may interest you to know that when France was still strong in directing the Far East, the Siamese people signed a non-aggression pact with France five days before the invasion of the Low Countries began, which proves that in May last there was not a real dispute on the carpet between the two countries. Otherwise, they wouldn't have signed a treaty of non-aggression. Something also must have happened to change the minds of the Siamese Government to that extent.

Another point which might interest you about Siam, is the reason for the Siamese suddenly becoming Thailandese people, adopting a name which is half-caste—Siamese at the beginning and English at the end. Well, if you remember what I told you about the population of Siam you will understand the meaning of that word, "Thailand". The word has no grammatical sense at all but has a lot of political sense. It means that the Siamese Government believes it should rule and govern all the Thai people, and as I told you, the Thai people means nothing less than Burma, the south of China and the greatest part of French Indo-China. Well, they have started already with French Indo-China. This, of course, was played upon by some-

thing which has happened since the time of the Navy and the Army and the Air Force and the peace that I was talking to you about a few minutes ago. What is this something? This something is Japan.

Of course it is very difficult to say exactly what is the amount of influence a country has in another country when it is well hidden, but still, since 1923 the Japanese have brought into Siam several large firms. They have an air-line in operation, they have control of the shipyards and they are the only people able to repair and maintain this ready-made Navy that the Siamese bought in Japan just before the outbreak of the present war. They have a strong influence, which can be judged by the fact that for about seven years the Siamese have been persecuting the Chinese community to their own detriment because the Chinese brought money into the country. They have set immigration taxes, they have stopped Chinese immigration, they have imprisoned Chinese business men on trifling pretexts, and so on.

Through all this we might have an idea of what has been the Japanese influence in Siam through all these years. But what can give us the greatest idea of all is the recent war between Siam and Indo-China, which had no reason at all to occur or to break out, and which ended, as all have seen, by Japanese mediation, the consequences of which are being felt very heavily right now.

Let us glance now on the Indo-Chinese side of the border. I won't give you any details about the geography, because you know that as well as I do. The population of Indo-China is chiefly Annamite, that is, of Chinese descent, with substantial minority groups of Cambodians and Chinese, as well as several other races living in the mountain regions in the north and west, some being Thai, and others the real originals of the country—savages, but very interesting to live with. They are mild and very pleasant, living on game and rice and having no political aptitude whatsoever.

This population of Indo-China is and was until last September when I left there, very true to France. I don't

say that because I am French, I say it because it is a fact. It is not through love—I won't say that—but they certainly realize what the French meant to them and they have a very lovely saying in Indo-China which shows that they understand the present situation. This Annamite saying is as follows: "The French eat bread, the Japanese eat rice." That is all. But that means a lot. That means, "We don't mind the French, they are no competitors, but the Japanese take the rice out of our mouth". And that is exactly what is going to happen. It has happened, as a matter of fact already. We have read in the papers, not later than a few weeks ago, that the Japanese have a price for their mediation. They are asking control of 80 per cent of the rice production of Indo-China. That gives an idea of how wise this Annamite proverb is.

The French Army and Air Force there, of course, are actually under Japanese control. That is a fact which can't be hidden. It is very important to have that in mind in order to understand the recent conflict. Of course, the French could not really wage war against the Siamese and then defend themselves. The scanty stock of munitions they had was checked over by the Japanese, and the French could not fire a shot without the Japanese knowing it and keeping a record of it—which means that they knew when it would be safe to ask for further privileges in Indo-China.

How have the Japanese gained such control over Indo-China? That is a point I would like to make clear to you. In June the armistice was signed in France and at that time Indo-China was ruled by General Catroux who was and is still my personal friend. He believed very much that the armistice was rotten and that French Indo-China should at all costs prosecute the war with the British Empire and be true to the word of honour France had pledged. (Applause.) I believe he did his best. He sent a Purchasing Commission to the United States to buy planes. For several reasons—among them the delay of the Clipper—this Purchasing Commission arrived late in July in the United States. He wanted to reinforce his defence. He

tried also to slacken the pace of the Japanese demands. He accepted three or four Japanese officers sent into Indo-China to control contraband, just in order to gain time. All the population was behind him.

From that day on, from the day of the armistice, a decree, issued in Vichy, ordered General Catroux to abandon his post and to give the reins of the government into the hands of Admiral Decoux.. At first he said to me, "I don't acknowledge that Government because anybody can sign 'Petain' to a wire or a radio report and I am not going to believe that." He replied to Vichy, "I have a letter signed by Petain. For the present I don't accept the order", but the orders came every day, more pressing, and by the end of July it appeared that Marshal Petain was really the man who signed the order. For several reasons, too long to go into right now, in one very sad evening we spent together at the end of July, he said, "Well, I don't think I can do very much. I will give up and Decoux is going to govern the country from now on." I said, "That is terrible. He will play into the hands of the Germans." He said, "I don't know. I am leaving and going to join de Gaulle." He joined General de Gaulle and was presently in Cairo and I guess he is taking part in the operations in Libya. I decided to join him later but my personal story is of no interest.

I stayed a month later than he did. As soon as Decoux was at the head of the Government the Japanese brought in more pressure. They said that they wanted to have their troops pass through Indo-China to invade China by the rear. If you have the map in mind you will understand what that means. This can deceive nobody because the border between China and Indo-China is jungle and nobody, not even a Japanese General, can cross the border with an army, and the secret purpose of that move was certainly different. Anyway, it was a blind, a cover.

Then we received an astounding order. We were filled with joy, but we did not understand what it meant. That order was that we wouldn't yield to the Japanese demands, we were going to fight the Japanese. We were

very much surprised when we received the order to fight. We were so pleased, and everybody got ready. Eight days after, another order came in and this order said, "You are not going to fight after all. Just accept the Japanese terms."

Well, the Japanese terms had not changed, and at the moment we could not guess what had made them suddenly palatable, since they hadn't been such the week before. We understood later on. In the month of September the world learned that Japan had joined the Axis Powers. It was easy to understand that Indo-China had been a price paid by Germany to lure Japan into the unknown terms of the German-Japanese alliance. At the beginning probably the Japanese resisted or did not comply with all the German terms, so the Germans said, "You are not going to have Indo-China", and an order went out to the people to defend themselves. Since the Japanese were in no shape to take Indo-China by force, they were pretty anxious to have us surrender. A week later they had complied, and the order came to let them in, and this is what happened.

In the month of October, not only did they not even try to invade China by the railway as they said they would do once they got in a position to do it, but they even withdrew the troops they had in Kwangsi Province, which is an adjacent part of the Indo-China border, which they would have used had they really intended to invade China.

What was their purpose? Their purpose was to get the southern part of Indo-China. It is very strange that the Japanese as well as the Germans don't dare say they will take anything because they want it. They believe they have tricks enough to do it. They always have to find the pretext that they are protecting somebody, which makes it sound civilized, and the Japanese said, "We must find a pretext to invade the south of Indo-China." They found two. The first did not work. They started riots, so-called Communist riots in Indo-China. Of course that didn't go, but the second worked all right. That was the Siamese War I was talking to you about a few minutes

ago, and the Siamese War has ended with a Japanese offer of negotiation, an offer dictated from Berlin; and it had a favourable answer because Vichy received the same orders from Berlin.

So here we are with Japan having a free hand, both in Siam and in Indo-China. What are the real aims of Japan? This is a question which certainly you have already discussed very often. There is one thing I want to tell you about. Of course they want territory, they want Indo-China, they want rubber, and I grant they are interested in tin. Those are the covers, those are the European reasons for a Japanese move.

The real situation in Japan is quite different. You get an explanation of that situation if you will read Japanese history. It has been a Japanese proverb for two thousand years, "Keep the Army busy, and if possible, away." Busy and away. Of course in the early years of Japan, that was not possible. The Army was at home and the Army being at home Japan was the theatre of the worst civil wars in the world for centuries. Finally, they reached a peace period that lasted one hundred and fifty years, when they had found a policy to keep the Army quiet, but the situation now is that Japan cannot face the problem of demobilizing her own Army, of turning loose some three million men with no plan ready for absorbing them in the domestic economy. They realize that under the guidance of very ambitious generals, military revolutions could be started one after another that would tear the Japanese Empire to pieces. The proverb is "Keep the Army busy and keep the Army away."

Peace is a very difficult problem. It needs a very high civilization. Plato said that democracy was the form of government suitable for a nation of aristocrats. I think that is a great fact. He meant an aristocracy of the soul and the heart, not of technique only. It is easier, you will agree with me, to build guns than to give every citizen a decent share of butter, and this is the reason that the Japanese have to make war forever.

This implies, of course, a very serious challenge. They

really run the risk of facing the United States Navy in the South Seas. For that they wanted a larger political surface, as well as technical help. Therefore, they were ready to comply with the German terms of alliance. The Germans, of course, wanted a fleet in the Pacific. Those are, most probably, partly the backgrounds of the German-Japanese Alliance. Of course, we must think from now on in terms of a German Fleet in the Pacific and no more of the Japanese Fleet. They have German investigators in Tokyo and of course their face will be saved. There will be Japanese officers in Berlin, but I don't believe the Japanese officers in Berlin will have very much say in the plans for the forthcoming invasion of England, but I do believe they will have something to say in the war in the Pacific, and of course we should prepare to face this reality.

But I am still full of hope. First of all, even if there were no United States help in that part of the world, I don't believe the Japanese are a match for whatever forces the British have in those parts of the world. (Applause.) I am even certain that they are no match for it, and that they are going to their doom. I am certain of that, even though for fifteen centuries it was the fate of France to fight and use her sword to protect civilization against the barbarians and for the first time in fifteen centuries this sword has fallen from France's hand. But the British have taken the sword again in Europe. They have raised it high. What are they going to do in the Far East? I don't exactly know but I am perfectly certain they are going to stop invaders in Asia, as they have stopped them in Europe. (Applause.)

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON: Gentlemen, I am sure you all agree that you would like me to say to Dr. May how grateful we are to him for finding time to come here and give us such an interesting talk about a very intricate and difficult problem, away in the furthest ends of the earth.

I am rather cheered, a great deal cheered, by what he

said with regard to the Japanese Navy. Most island nations are good sailors and the Japanese have boasted a bit about their seamanship and about their naval effectiveness. You must be a bit of a sailor if you live on an island, because there is no other way of getting off it occasionally.

I think, Sir, that you have clarified the situation and given us an enlightened idea of just what is occurring away in that far eastern part of the world and you have cheered us with the confident hope that the old British Navy can take care of that part of the world, just as it has the rest of the world. I am very sure that every one here has intensely enjoyed your talk.

Frenchmen are not the only people that wander about the world. I was thinking when the Doctor was talking, about another little experience I had at Bangkok, which is a beautiful city. A chap came to meet me and he told me he was the head and director of the newly inaugurated Flying Service in Siam. He took my wife and myself out to lunch at his home. It turned out he was a Canadian and his wife was a Canadian, and it just struck me as remarkable that the reputation of our flying men, for intelligence and organizing capacity and for courage has gone a long way about the world. This man occupied a very important position there and was very happy in the work that he was carrying on.

Then you will recall—I have forgotten now whether the little King of Siam visited Canada or not, I was in the Old Country at the time, he travelled far, at any rate—and I never knew why he didn't go back to Siam unless he was afraid the guns would get plugged up. He was a delightful person, so was his wife—they were intelligent, with vision and a constructive outlook on the world, unselfish and public-spirited with regard to all these great problems that have become a part of the complicated problem of bringing about a better type of civilization and a better measure of peace to us all.

Doctor, again may I say to you we are all indeed deeply grateful to you for the delightful talk you have given us to-day. (Applause.)

"CANADA IN CRISIS—AS SEEN BY AN AUSTRALIAN"

AN ADDRESS BY

THE REVEREND FREDERICK W. NORWOOD,
D.D.

Chairman: The President, The Honourable G. Howard
Ferguson.

Thursday, February 20, 1941

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON: Gentlemen: The guest-speaker to-day, Dr. Norwood, has been good enough to give way for three or four minutes while I perform a very interesting little act. We have all read with horror and with deep sympathy of the destruction, of the destitution that has been done to the homes and to thousands of people in Great Britain by the Hun and we have all been doing everything we can to help rehabilitate them.

The *Toronto Evening Telegram* has performed a unique service in that respect. They opened a fund and without any cost whatever they are receiving subscriptions and transmitting them directly to the Lord Mayor of London to aid the distressed people who have held the front line for us ever since the Huns broke loose some time ago. I think when the history of the war is written there should be full credit and special emphasis placed upon the fact that the little East Enders in London have set an example to the world, of heroism and determination, by the stand they have taken in resisting and holding out under these attacks, under the most distressing circumstances.

The Empire Club has asked the *Telegram* to come here to-day and Mr. Snider is here, representing that great

family journal, that we might show in a practical way as an Empire Club, our interest and our desire to aid in that splendid work that is being carried on by them, and it is my very happy opportunity to-day to present, on behalf of the Empire Club, to the *Toronto Evening Telegram* for the *Distressed Victims Fund* in London a check for \$500. (Applause.) I might tell you the check is marked.

MR. C. H. J. SNIDER: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Empire Club: I am doubly relieved at finding that the check is marked and contains the necessary stamps. As you know, all the administration charges of the Fund are met by the *Telegram*, and we have to look after the postage stamps as well. It certainly brings us further on our way toward our objective. I have often been asked what is the *Telegram's* objective? Is it half a million, a million dollars, or what? Well, there is no secret about the objective. The objective is sufficient to comfort, care for and relieve the suffering of all who are the victims of this prolonged attack upon the British Isles. When that objective is attained we will cease fire, and you may cease fire with our blessing, and I know it will be with theirs. Mr. Chairman, I thank you and I thank the Club.

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON: Now, it is a very great pleasure and honour to me to have the opportunity of presenting to you to-day one—I was going to say one of Canada's most distinguished sons, although Dr. Norwood, our guest, was born in Australia. He shows the wisdom of Australians—he came to Canada in the end, and I hope he will remain here as a friend and citizen of this country.

It is not my purpose and it would be gratuitous were I to attempt to pay compliments or say congratulatory things to Dr. Norwood. He is known all over this continent. He is known in the British Isles where he occupied the City Temple pulpit in London for a very considerable time. He was an active participant in the last war and if he were a bit younger I am quite sure he would be in the front line

at the present time. At any rate, Dr. Norwood is intensely interested, of course, in all British affairs and particularly, like the rest of us, zealous to do what he can to promote the success of British arms. Dr. Norwood has been good enough during the very busy mission he has here in Toronto, to come to us to-day to talk to us on a subject with which he is familiar, and I have no doubt he will be most informative and interesting. He talks to us on the subject: "Canada in Crisis, as Seen by An Australian". I don't know how long the Australian trademark lasts—most of these things fail—and I expect when he next lectures to us he will come as a Canadian. Dr. Norwood. (Applause.)

THE REVEREND FREDERICK W. NORWOOD, D.D.: Mr. President and Gentlemen: As far as I remember, I called my talk, "Canada in Crisis, as Seen by a Non-Canadian." I feel it is rather a bold thing for a man who is not a Canadian, and who indeed is only a recent arrival in the Dominion, to speak to Canadians about their own country, especially if he should venture to prophesy a little. I can only say that after nearly two score years in Australia and more than a score of years in London, England, I chose Canada as a place of residence, I hope for the period that may be left to me in life, because I have a strong sense of the destiny of this country. At the moment, when I felt after twenty-three years that I wanted a change I had before me two invitations in England, two in Canada, one in Australia and one I knew I could have if I wanted it, in the United States of America. And I chose Canada for reasons that I will try to explain to you.

I have, of course, always been impressed by the vastness of the country. Canada, as you know, is the third largest country in the world, thinking of countries in terms of their governments. Russia is larger, China is larger, the United States, if you include the dependencies and the lightly held Philippines is slightly larger than Canada. Canada is one-fourth the size of the British Empire. Canada is very little smaller than the continent of Europe.

Those things are tremendously impressive, but it is not simply its vastness of area, but the gigantic manner of its structure that always has fascinated me.

An English lady not long ago, who had travelled across the country by the Transcontinental Railway and with whom I was talking, in reply to my question, "What do you think of Canada?", said, "It frightens me. It is all in such great chunks." That is a correct description of Canada.

You have that marvellous Canadian Shield which covers quite two-thirds of the whole area, a mass of pre-Cambrian rock, in the main, as old almost as anything in the world with which we are familiar, which has largely stamped the impression of Canada upon the minds of the people of the world and which for a long time over-awed Canadians themselves. Someone has said it is like a giant hand, the thumb comprising Labrador and a portion of Quebec, and the other fingers curled around Hudson's Bay, as if some giant hand were seeking to throttle Canada.

It is very unfertile, except for scattered pockets here and there and deep ravines. It is rich in mineral treasures, has marvellous hydraulic resources, but it is incapable of very great fertility. Lord Tweedsmuir said recently in his own very apt way that what men had long thought to be a barren wilderness we know now to be the lid of a vast treasure-house. In that area there is gold, silver, nickel, copper, platinum and many other precious minerals. In an era when the world is turning away from agriculture, when nations are striving to become industrialized, when the world has been held in the grip of war, your almost incredible mineral resources make you a tremendous factor in world destiny.

Then beyond the Canadian Shield, you have the prairie lands frightening in their width and breadth and level grandeur, where it is no wonder the fathers thought they saw the granary of the world and felt that Canada's power to raise wheat and other cereals was virtually unlimited.

Then beyond that you have the Rocky Mountains, not

perhaps the greatest in the world, but among them. Surely there are few clusters of mountains more impressive than those of the Canadian Rockies. The Himalayas, doubtless, are vaster and bigger and greater, but the Rockies take one's breath away when he sees them for the first time, and if he is at all sensitive when he sees them for the hundredth time.

You have got half the fresh water that there is on the surface of the globe, if you consider the Great Lakes as being part of Canada. You have got three mighty rivers—the St. Lawrence, one of the world's most significant, and two others—the Mackenzie and the Saskatchewan, which, however, turn their direction northwards and so for the time being their significance is not adequately recognized.

Away to the north you have the vast territories that are so frequently covered with snow, where wild animals have always abounded in great numbers, which have lured huntsmen, trappers, fur traders, from the very beginning of your history. There is really no occasion to go to the wilds nowadays if you want to get furs, because you can breed animals on farms better than they grow naturally in the wilderness. You can protect them from the accidents and the conflicts that come to them in a state of nature and get richer and better furs under cultivation.

You can grow in many parts of the North West, wheat, potatoes and other things. You have now means of transit, transport, which are at once among the most primitive and among the most modern. You can still find a place for the dog sled. You can also uncover the riches of those territories by the plane or by caterpillar traction.

To the north you have got the almost unknown solitudes of the polar regions. To the south you have got one of the greatest nations on the earth, but one most friendly to yourselves, and on the east and the west you are protected by two vast oceans—the Atlantic and the Pacific. "Gigantically formed, wildly clad," someone has said of Canada.

I am an Australian who has lived for years in England. The aspect which Nature wears is strangely varying in this

world. I do not wonder that England produced poets like Wordsworth or others of his type, who looked on Nature as the benign friend of man, idealized her generally, spoke of her in feminine terms and loved to describe her quiet and beauty. It pains me to the very soul to think now that those sylvan glades of rich meadows and gentle streams are now among the accompaniments of a fortress. I often think of the words of the old seventeenth century poet, John Denham, describing the Thames. He said:

O could I flow like thee, and made thy stream
My great example, as it is my theme!
Though deep, yet clear, though gentle, yet not dull,
Strong without rage, without o'erflowing full.

Now, I, like my friend on the right, was born in Australia, and Australia, they say, is the last place God made, and it looks as if He were growing weary when he got to that point. It is a large country, too. It is peculiarly primitive, vast regions there that have not yet been conquered by the whites, and are scarcely inhabited by the blacks. There is not a great deal that is awesome in Australia, frightening. There is a great deal that seems almost sinister.

My people were pioneers. They were among the very first generation in the central part of Australia and I was fed with travellers' tales when I was a child, instead of nursery rhymes, and I had the impression that I grew up with a kind of feeling that Nature was man's enemy. She fought him, she burned him, she drowned him, she starved him, she caused him to be lost. That kind of instinctive feeling remained with me until I had grown up to maturity and I was tremendously startled when I saw the sweet beauty of England. But Canada—she is not sylvan, quietly beautiful, neither does she seem hostile nor vindictive, she seems absolutely indifferent to man. She dwarfs him, she doesn't care that he is there, she doesn't even notice him. There must be some sort of kink in my

own nature that makes me always love big things. If I had to choose between big, bad things and little, good things, I am afraid I would make the wrong choice. The bigness of Canada, its gigantic structure, its wild attire—that has fascinated me for the past twenty odd years. Although I have only come to live here less than two years ago, I have been here at least a score of times before that. By the way, I arrived just at the same time as the King and Queen. There was no collusion about that.

But, Mr. President, it is not even that that fascinates me, holds me, makes me want to live here. It is the strategic significance of Canada that to me is very real, though I confess I often have the feeling that Canadians themselves are not always aware of it.

Gentlemen, you are not governing your own country. You think you are. There are at least four other peoples that are determining your history more than you are yourselves—conditioning your life, shaping your destiny—and there is not overmuch that you can do about it.

The Germanic powers are hammering out your future. Canada herself had no direct conflict with the Germanic powers. Canada herself was not consulted in the matters that led to the war. Canada herself, so far as she had expressed her policy, was disposed to remain a western country, belonging to the American continent. When the war broke out His Majesty, the King, declared war on the 3rd of September, but it was six days after that before Canada decided to go into war, and now everything you have got in your country is in a state of suspense or uncertainty. You cannot intelligently plan far ahead until you know whether the Germans are to be defeated or will be victorious. Were they to be victorious they would consider Canada as part of their spoils. *When* they are defeated—and you notice I don't say *if*—when they are defeated the condition and characteristics of Canada will be radically changed.

Great Britain is fashioning your history. You do not resent it. You are glad of it, but for all that it is quite significant, and we ought not to be oblivious to it. Canada

is whole-heartedly in the conflict with Britain. She is in fact decisive in the conflict. This war could not be fought without Canada. The little British Islands are very, very small and they are terribly exposed. They are inexpressibly precious. The ancient treasures and traditions that they stand guard over are such as the world cannot afford to lose. But there isn't anything in Britain that might not be bombed at this hour. You would know that if you had, as I have, seven or eight of your kith and kin dotted about, in the Islands. If the lanes across the sea to Canada were not open, Britain would starve. Britain's wealth, upon which she built up her strength was largely coal and iron, but coal is very deep now. She has not enough for her needs. Canada has not so very much coal, though she has a great deal of it, but she has wonderfully powerful hydraulic assistance and she has tin and nickel and other precious metals that are of unutterable value in this conflict. Canada is becoming the arsenal of Britain, more and more, the reservoir for her air power, her granary, her forests whence the timber comes, largely a connecting link between Britain and the United States, exceedingly important in matters of finance and doubtless more and more significant as the war goes on.

Gentlemen, you are not doing that yourselves so much by deliberate Canadian policy as it is being thrust upon you from without. That is the point I am making and still there is another great country that is tremendously affecting you. I mean the United States of America. Let us say with thankfulness that we do not resent that. There is a marvellous affinity between these two great countries in North America, not an identity, by any means, but an affinity. We are probably apt to forget this. We have had our clashes in times gone by. Time was when the people of the United States ignored Canada. Time was when they wished to annex it. Time was when they almost fought to conquer it. It is not a matter of indifference, but fortunately, it is a matter upon which we can bank with great confidence, that these two peoples speak the same language and cherish in the main the same ideals, and have

largely the same interests. It would be very embarrassing at this hour if the United States were on the Germanic side or if the United States actively resented and resisted the present war. Canada would then be an embarrassment to herself, to Britain and to the United States. As it is she is largely conditioning the development of the United States. She makes the so-called Monroe Doctrine seem impossible now. The Monroe Doctrine was never more than a figure of speech, save that it was backed up by the strength of Britain, but it is only rational that the great western world, North and South America, had no designs upon Europe, wished to be neutral, independent, peaceful, but Canada breaks through that every time. Canada is now in the European war. The United States is not yet, though I think she is coming in backwards, the same way that most nations are getting into this war, Gentlemen, backwards. I think there were only two or three that went into it with deliberate wish.

This tremendous world that is becoming more and more closely knit, has to face the inevitable truth, if you are to have war, then you are going to have world war, and here, at this time, the destiny of the United States is deeply conditioning the destiny of Canada; and yet I am not through. There is an awakening or an awakened Asia, Gentlemen.

I may be a little bit cranky, but I have a kind of belief that that is really the most significant thing that is happening to-day. I don't mean significant in the sense that it threatens us with battle or destruction, but I mean significant in the sense that when the present struggle between Japan and China has worked itself out, however it shall go, you will have an awakened China, as well as an alert Japan, modernized, mechanized, militarized, bringing to bear a new philosophy and culture, and the same old economic necessities, but with a terrific difference in the way of their administration. For the next hundred years, let us be sure of it, the great question in the world will be the adjustment of the interests of the Occident and the Orient, and in that area, Canada becomes, in spite of her

small population and not because of her gigantic area, but because of her strategic central position, tremendously significant.

So, Gentlemen, there you are, as I see it, as an Australian. Perhaps you won't see it so readily, or if you did, you wouldn't state it so frankly, but once it is stated you can't deny it, can you? After all, it isn't peculiar. It becomes more and more the case with all nations, for whether the world is getting better and better, or worse and worse, it certainly is getting more and more closely knit, and nations are more deeply intertwined and inextricably associated.

So what for Canada? Well, I would say if you will allow me, speaking as a non-Canadian, and yet as a lover of Canada, I would say, first of all, you mustn't trust in anybody else. You must be strong within yourselves. You must build your own country on your own character. It is no longer safe in this world to be a cat's paw for the policies of other nations. That first, but when we have said that, let us say this: Of all countries in the world, Canada should be supremely interested in world order. If Canada should think she can be isolated, she will be following a mirage. Her people had better foster the kind of mental culture that will make them world citizens, world lawyers, world statesmen, because they will have to help build up some kind of system that can hold in check these awful modern methods of war and, Gentlemen, surely this is a great opportunity for Canada. Surely there could be no greater thing come out of this war than a closer association between the English-speaking peoples of the world. (Applause.)

I confess that I hardly see any rock upon which we could certainly build, if not that, and if that is so, then here is Canada, the link between the people of the British Islands and the people of the United States, kindred with both, having mutual interests, but Canada not wishing to surrender her association with the British Empire. She would be foolish if she did.

I read sometimes, here and there in this country, glib

prophecies about the centre of Empire shifting to the west, and all that. Well, you know, those little islands are pretty hard to shift. (Applause.) The truth is Britons, themselves, throughout the Empire, don't want them shifted. Australia doesn't want it. We love Canada but we are not prepared that she should substitute for Westminster. Besides, if Canada were not part of the British Empire she would be a poor relation of the United States, whereas now you are a self-respecting member of a great Empire, and your prestige and dignity are enhanced by your British association.

On the other hand, everything in this country cries out that this continent is structurally one. All your divisions run north and south, except your political divisions. Your political divisions criss-cross the natural divisions. I mean the Maritimes and your Eastern States of America are tremendously similar. Your Ontario and upper New York State—you wouldn't know which you were in if you weren't told. Your prairie lands and the Dakotas—how do you know when you leave one and enter the other? Your Rockies run right down over the border, with no difference, save that they gradually get lower and slighter; and your Pacific Coast—I defy you to remember when you are in Canada or the United States, at least until the other day when they commenced to enforce new regulations that demand you should be finger-printed and all the rest, if you cross.

This country, by destiny, by structure, by physical formation, as well as by the climatic and cultural influences that mould people all the time, ought not to be hostile or severed from the people south of us in the States. (Applause.)

So, as I see Canada, she stretches out one hand to the little old Islands that are the shrine of everything we cherish and revere, and the other hand to the great husky Republic that with us is striving through the same environment. Canada has a great privilege.

And, Gentlemen, you won't be surprised if my last note is my most passionate. You know what I am. I hold

that the basic things in the world are moral. You can't build a great country except on great character and there we have perhaps got to watch it. You know I begin to think that Canada is a tropical country. You used to be fascinated by the snows and the ice, but since I came here I occasionally feel as if I should move to the tropics to cool off. I was watching them curling last night in one of your magnificent clubs, and I fancy the players were in the cold—though they were well wrapped up—but all the people looking on were in a hothouse for comfortable spectators. I can't get cool in Canada now. I find I shouldn't speak of Toronto—it is some years since I was here—but Vancouver troubles me a bit. It is so beautiful that if they don't look out they will get soft. They just want a good time in life and they will have it, but we have got to get back that pioneering spirit. We need it more than the old pioneers did. They thought those rugged old pioneers were going out to the edge of the world to carve a new world, and lo, they are sending back their grandsons into the heart of Europe to beat out and fight out the destiny of their country on ancient land.

If there is one place in the world where men should not sleep, it is Canada. If there is one place in the world where we should cultivate the rugged virtues, the things that really have made us great and can alone keep us great, it is Canada.

You know, Hitler said a little before he launched the war, to Rauschnig, "The Democracies have gone soft. The Democracies have nothing that they are ready to die for. Men will not fight in the Democracies except for money or for pleasure."

Well, he was wrong, thank God. But, superficially, he was right. He might not have launched the war if he had known how wrong he was, but I don't wonder at people of his mentality looking at Canada or even Australia, and suspecting that we had not the grit we really have.

I plead for tremendous faith in Canada, and for rock-bottom devotion to the sterling qualities of right living and clean thinking and hard striving. Hitler said in one

of his harangues to his countrymen "We shall take the road back." Canada should say. "We shall take the road forward." (Applause.)

THE HONOURABLE G. HOWARD FERGUSON: Gentlemen, your very warm reception of Dr. Norwood's stirring address will be interpreted by him better than any words of mine, but I would like to say on behalf of all the members of the Club, how grateful we are to you, Sir, for coming here to-day and giving us such a stirring address, the sort of address that we need once in a while. (Applause.) You very properly have said, perhaps, that we are going soft in this country, perhaps that we are not sufficiently aroused to the danger that threatens at the moment, but I think perhaps you are scarcely right when you say that Canada was reluctant to go into the war. I think every citizen of Canada realizes the importance of maintaining the British Empire, the source of all the inspiration for good that is to be found anywhere in the world, and we, as Canadians, I think, are determined that we are going to do our very utmost to uphold that Empire and to retain our connection as a part of that great Empire.

Your address to-day, Doctor, brings all that home to us, gives us an opportunity of thinking again about the serious part that Canada can play, about the important part that we will play, that we are to some extent at the moment playing. I think our war effort is increasing daily and you could have no better evidence of it, than this magnificent fund to which we have made a small contribution to-day. I have often thought that the great thing about that voluntary fund of the *Telegram* is not what you and I and business houses and clubs are giving, but what every day, the little school houses, away back in the country, the church clubs, are contributing. I was born and bred in the country and I know the impression that these things make, and we are bringing all these youngsters up to feel that they are taking part in upholding the ideals for which we stand, in upholding the great centre of the universe, from which we get a rich heritage,

all the traditions and all the best inspiration that life can bring.

Again, Dr. Norwood, I should like to thank you most heartily for what I think we will all agree was a most timely, most interesting and most inspiring address. (Applause.)

"THERE ARE NO CIVILIANS IN LONDON"

AN ADDRESS BY

MRS. MARCUS DIMSDALE.

Chairman: Mr. W. Eason Humphreys.

Thursday, February 27, 1941

MR. W. EASON HUMPHREYS: Ladies and Gentlemen: The Honourable Mr. Ferguson greatly regretted his inability to be here to-day. He has, unfortunately for us, been called to the West. He, however, has asked me to welcome those members who are honouring us with their presence to-day from the English-speaking Union and the United Empire Loyalists Association and we do extend to you a very sincere welcome.

Our speaker to-day, among her immediate Toronto friends is known as "Our Lady of the Snows." The reason for that is that my wife and I had the privilege of entertaining Mrs. Dimsdale at dinner last November when we had a very, very heavy storm, and as I happen to live just outside Toronto, unfortunately for Mrs. Dimsdale and very fortunately for us, we were unable to get her out. She tells me to-day that she had a similar experience—I think it was in Buffalo—so I think we shall call her with affection "Our Lady of the Snows."

Mrs. Dimsdale comes from a distinguished Welsh family. That family has given to the Empire a very full quota of distinguished soldiers and Parliamentarians. Mrs. Dimsdale's family, I think I can say, are really steeped in war. Mrs. Rosemary Marshall, her daughter, is a pilot and has returned to England leaving her children

here. She is working in the Cambridge Airport and Mrs. Dimsdale tells me she has just heard from her daughter that one of the German pilots attempted to machine-gun her in her garden. We are very glad to hear that Mrs. Dimsdale's daughter escaped injury.

Mrs. Dimsdale is a first-class graduate of Oxford and won a fellowship at Cambridge. She took charge of some eight hundred refugees during the last war, for which the Queen of Belgium honoured her with a medal. She was later appointed Assistant Director of Milk Supplies in the Ministry of Food, under Lord Rhondda.

She arrived in Canada last June with a plan of receiving evacuee children and delivering addresses under the sanction of the Ministry of Information.

I, therefore, have very great pleasure, Ladies and Gentlemen, in introducing "Our Lady of the Snows," Mrs. Marcus Dimsdale. (Applause.)

MRS. MARCUS DIMSDALE: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: It is a very great pleasure to me to be invited to speak to your august assembly on this, my first visit to Canada. One cannot but be impressed by the beauty of your wonderful country and by the intelligence and hard work of your men and women. If the people of England are showing courage and fortitude at this time, you are showing real generosity and giving hard work. If our places were reversed I have no question but that you would have been as brave and I hope that we should be as kind.

I am rather embarrassed by my notes to-day. I never write a speech and I was told to do so. If you see me referring to the manuscript I hope you will forgive me.

I want for a moment to speak about England before the war, because so many people say to me how England has changed, what a revolution we have had, and things like that. I do want to say a word on this subject, as an English-woman coming from England, because we have not changed. We were exactly like this before but there was something clamping us down, something very sinister which fortunately has been smashed and which will never

happen again. How it came about I think, has something to do with the last war. We lost in that war the flower of our youth. We let all the young men who offered themselves first—the politicians, the scientists, the poets, the artists, the sculptors, the most brilliant of our youth—we let them go into the front-line trenches and in that way we have lost a generation. And the old men made the peace, and it is the old men who have been ruling England through the last crucial years before this war. I say old, but I don't mean old merely in years, because we have many examples of those who never grow old in years—I mean those who were old in vision.

I am only going to tell you of the signs of it that I have seen in my own life. You perhaps heard of the vote of the young men at Oxford when the best young men of England voted that they would never die for King and Country. The old men of England were horrified. They said, "This is Red. This is something terrible. There is a Red Revolution." It was not so. England was never Red. The young men were never Red. But when they had no other way to protest and show their impatience with the stupidity and lack of vision of the powers that be, the only thing to do was something rather extravagant so they would be noticed. And the young men did something rather extravagant and they were noticed.

Then other things happened. As you know, there was Manchuria and Abyssinia. Such was the uproar in England over Abyssinia and the Hoare-Laval Treaty, that the government of the old men had to take Sir Samuel Hoare and practically pull him down and hide him because of the fury of the people in England.

Then there came Spain and when the young men of England couldn't make their voice heard they went and fought and died in Spain, telling the government what it would mean to the world if Franco won.

My own son, a Cambridge scientist of thirty-two, wrote to Winston Churchill saying, "I represent a number of young men who know that England is all wrong, who know that the world is wrong and are terrified at what is

going to happen and they believe that you are the one man who could save it. If you will tell us what to do we will do it." And Winston wrote back to them a charming letter and thanked them very much. He said that they were quite right but that there was nothing they could do. In his own words, "England is ruled by the Conservative Party machine"—and, if I could ever write the history of my own times, I should add to that "and the Treasury," which in England at that period had lost all vision.

I don't suppose you would understand what the Conservative Party machine was in England. There had been an election at perhaps a bad time and it had come into power with a majority. The young men were not very enlightened and they would follow wherever the Whip would lead. An extraordinarily gifted young Sergeant-Major became the Whip—David Margesson, who with the machine in his hands had unheard-of powers over Parliament. He made it into a most extraordinary machine and nobody said him nay, except Winston. They were afraid of Winston. Winston was outside the machine. No by-election was to be allowed at Epping.

But when Munich was followed by hopelessly futile war preparations, the thunder broke and the people of England would stand it no longer. Then that House of Commons had to awake. In the hands of Winston, England has acquired or rather regained that freedom which she never had under Chamberlain and the old men.

I can tell you, from my own experience, how it was chalked up all over London, in turn, "Swinton must go," "Burgin must go," "Chamberlain must go." I have seen processions in Hyde Park holding umbrellas over dummy figures. The feeling was there all the time in England. Everybody can say what they like on the soap boxes in the park. They were saying it, too. I used to go and listen with the greatest interest. It wasn't until there was something really serious that the thunder broke. Then we had Winston.

You remember that when Burgin was appointed Minister of Supply, there was a deadly silence in the

House of Commons, and a Labour man ejaculated, "My God!" And when Sir Thomas Inskip was made Minister to Co-ordinate Defence instead of Winston, an old and eminent statesman is reported to have said, "There has never been such an appointment since Caligula made his horse a Consul."

I have a letter in my hand from a young man in London, dated February 2, 1941, and he says, "The striking feature now is that the country is united which it really never was at any time under the last Government. Parliament is really doing its job which it has never done for years, merely because of our slackness in letting it be run by Party machines. I don't think that mistake will ever be made again. We are a democratic country and it is always *our* fault when the Government goes wrong."

France had its troubles, but in a different way, and France had not the same power of recovery. I was very much struck by the first chapter in André Maurois' book, in which he tells how Winston met him in 1938 at a luncheon party and said, "Will you please write an article, a poem or a letter every day, to say that the French must have an Air Force." Maurois said, "I don't know anything about an Air Force." Winston said, "It doesn't matter, write it." Maurois said, "I wish now I had."

We invited the French Air Force to have a practice flight over England and I was among the interested spectators who looked at all the aeroplanes going over and I thought to myself, "How splendid this is—our Ally." When I later spoke to a young airman, expressing that same view, he only replied, "There is *no* French Air Force," and I realized that he knew.

Then our campaign in France was begun—the campaign of the old men of 1914—and you won't mind me quoting my family—a nephew of mine was sent out to see something of the stores and comforts accumulated in France. He told me he was horrified by the comforts—the store-houses full of woollies and chocolates and smokes. He said, "The Medical Officers are kicking at the number of smokes per man."

Don't let us make that mistake again. We don't want comforts first. We don't want food sent to England first. What we want is ships and more ships; what we want is planes and more planes, and munitions and more munitions.

Then came the war of civilians and the civilians' answer. It began in France. You all know well the story of the refugees in France. I heard your press woman, Elizabeth Arnold, tell the tale the other day and what she told about one village impressed me very much. She told of a village where they were told that all must leave—the work of the fifth column—and they hastily packed up their clothes, their babies, their old people, into prams and trucks and they got upon the road. One woman had forgotten her most precious things which she had tied in a handkerchief and put on a kitchen table. Her little boy said he would go back for it. When he got back the village was gone. It was nothing but a heap of rubble, and that is how Hitler not only got those people on the road but kept them on the road. What can you do with refugees who have nowhere to go? They couldn't go back, they went forward but they had nowhere to go. That was his first use of Civilians against the English and the French armies. They stopped our armies but when they got in the way of the German armies the German tanks rode over them. Our own soldiers tell us this is true.

That was the first round of the civilian battle and the answer was Dunkerque. I have just been reading a little book by a young man I know, an actor, and he calls it *My First War*. It is worth reading. It is typical of the English young man, and he says at the end that people may think it was a defeat but it wasn't. The soldiers had never been defeated. They knew they were as good as anyone else and far better but they were continually being told to go backward. They didn't know why but they went backward. They didn't realize what had happened to the Belgian Army and the Belgian King, and they didn't know what jeopardy they were in. They didn't know that

prayers were being offered in England for the safety of the men. They didn't know that Winston Churchill had said, "Heavy news may be before us."

The Admiralty called out the civilians of England. The Admiralty is a very great place, if, Mr. President, you will allow me to call it a place. The Admiralty called out every boat on the South Coast that would float.

Colonel Wallace, whom I met in Ottawa the other day, was in command of the guns in Dunkerque and he was the last man off. He told me that eight hundred and fifty boats registered as coming over but more than one thousand came. All the old men and the girls and the young lads on the South Coast who knew something about an oar or a sail or how to turn over an engine, simply went into that hell which was Dunkerque, a blazing furnace with bombs falling all the time, and brought back their own men. They brought back the Army of England to save England. That was the second round in the civilian war.

Colonel Wallace told me there were two other very remarkable things at Dunkerque. He said he walked on the beach and great rollers came in, rollers such as would have broken up any small boat, and an hour or two afterward the rollers were gone. Even the wind, which had been north-east, veered and brought the smoke of the burning oil vats right across the beaches, hiding the men from the German bombers.

The next round was the Battle of England, the battle of the civilians of England. Some people call it the Battle of Britain, some people call it the Battle of London, and Sir Norman Angell tells me I must call it the Battle of the Rights of Men, and I think he is right. It began with the children. Children were machine-gunned on the Island of Scilly. Children were machine-gunned on the beaches at Weymouth. They were machine-gunned in Surrey, on the way to school, and men, women and children were all bombed in their homes, schools, workshops, hospitals and in the streets.

What was the answer? The civilians' answer was the

Battle of London and it was the work of the ordinary men and women, and with all these women present to-day I feel perhaps I may speak especially about the work of the women. Hitler was trying to conquer by fear. We must never be afraid, no one must ever be afraid. The children were unafraid. "Johnnie is your mother frightened in an air-raid?" "I don't think so, she just says 'Johnnie come along, it is only an air-raid'." Fear is not going to conquer and fear was Hitler's chief weapon. He thought if he got the women and the children afraid that the others would have to give in, but the answer of the people of England, the answer of the civilians of England always is to do a little more than they were already doing to combat Hitler.

My eldest daughter is an Inspector of Factories at Sheffield and when she was bombed out, she signed on for six hours more work in the evening to drive an ambulance. That is the sort of natural retort. In England there are now four million women in industry. There are thousands in the Army, there are thousands in the Navy and there are thousands in the Air Force. In the Army, the Auxiliary Territorial Service, we consider that twenty-five thousand women will release twenty thousand men. In the Navy they are working at all the naval home establishments, releasing men, and in the Air Force they are also doing a good deal of scientific work. I was told by Professor Fowler, another Englishman here on a scientific mission, that it is the women who are so unmoved by the bombs falling that the Air Force has decided to put men and women together in all the dangerous places, because the men are afraid to say they don't like the bombs when the women are there, and it seems to work the same way with the women.

I am pleased because I have always held that anything that is good in the world must be with men and women together, that the basis of life is the family and a family is a man and a woman, that the basis of the world is the child and the upbringing and education of the child is the judgment of the man and the woman together. It is

absolutely essential that they should be together to get a fine, sound judgment.

Well, in England, it used to be, when I was young "Is that a job for a woman?" Now it is "Is there a woman to do this job?" My daughter-in-law is a doctor in London and her hospital in London was bombed, but they are carrying on. She says, "It is very popular to be a woman in London to-day. There is nothing they won't do for us. Compliments are showered on us. Everything the women can do they are asked to do."

My son is manager of five factories around London and he told me that he could not have believed the bravery of the young women between eighteen and twenty-five unless he had seen it. He said, "They sleep in their clothes. They sleep in shelters and holes in the ground and they turn up every day at nine o'clock, just the same."

It began with the restaurant girls who said, "It is much more important for the others to have hot food than it is for us to be safe. May we go on while the raid is on?", and presently they had to ask all to go on working and they answered, "That is what we want to do." He said to me that soldiers have all sorts of aids to fortitude. We give them uniforms, bonuses and pensions and medals and things for their wives, but these little civilian girls haven't anything, there is nobody to give them a bonus or pensions or medals. They are just brave.

The other day I travelled to Toronto with two Canadian business men who have been for two and a half months in English factories and I said to them, "Look, here, will you each tell me two tales about what you have seen in England," and eventually each of them told me three. I must tell you the first one. There was a factory in Manchester and when the bombs fell the men all went to the air-raid shelters. The girls didn't, but the output was delayed. The management were worried. The girls said, "Leave it to us," and the next morning, or whenever it was when the sirens went, they all lined up and they sang, "Run, Rabbit, Run"—and this Canadian man said to me, "It never happened again."

Then the other man across the table said, "I have seen women and children putting out incendiary bombs in the streets." The other said, "I saw a middle-aged woman at Coventry who was taking long turns as a fire watcher and I said to her, 'Are you doing that for a factory?' " "Oh, no, just for my neighbours' safety." That impressed him very much. The other thing that impressed him was the extraordinary skill of the women in the factories. They told me there was one girl who had only worked for two years and was doing what Canadian and American men take fifteen to twenty years doing, and in Canada she would have earned \$1.50 an hour. There was another called a knockabout—(I am not very good on these things but apparently a knockabout knows every machine in the shop) and they tell me they were coming back to start training women in Canada with the same high hopes, and I am sure those hopes will be carried out, and the women of Canada will be as good as the women of England. They are all in the front line.

In London, as I said before, the war of civilians, the Battle of Britain, the Battle of the Rights of Men, is going on all the time. If you are between the ages of sixteen and sixty you have to put out incendiary bombs, you have to watch for the fires, you have to be ready to work and I think one of the finest works in London is that of the fire watchers and the firemen. Once or twice in Canada I have had hopes that you were going to send some firemen to England because our firemen, who work night and day, and there are some millions of men, are getting pretty tired, and I imagined perhaps you would send a dozen men from each of your big cities and they would come to relieve them, but it doesn't seem to have happened yet.* A thousand have been killed in London. How many women, I don't know, but there are a great number of women firemen.

The point in London is you may not be brave but you have got to pretend you are. My youngest daughter who

*I have been told since that Canada has offered but England has refused.—E.D.

is in the Ministry of Supply—her husband is at the war—is living in a flat by herself. She said to me, “I am often very scared, don’t think I am brave all the time.”

The old Government in England put up the so-called “Safety First” motto. It is a rotten sort of motto, I think—it may be all right when you are crossing a road, but for life—no—we have done with that. “Nothing venture, nothing win”—but not “Safety First.”

And the King and Queen, our King and Queen, have set a most splendid example. They live dangerously. I would like to tell you about the first bomb that fell on Buckingham Palace. The King and Queen had been to the country and they came up on Monday morning. They had gone up to the Queen’s boudoir and had thrown up the sash window and they were both leaning out, and at that moment the bomb fell in the outer court-yard. The Queen said that she thought the King was killed and the King thought the Queen was killed, the concussion was so terrific. When they pulled themselves together and came out of the room, on the landing of the staircase they saw two fat little pages, who had evidently been told, quite rightly, that when there was an air-raid the right thing to do was to lie on their tummies under a table. They were just crawling out, and the Queen said that it made her laugh and it made the King laugh and they both felt better. She went to the kitchen and the cook was still cooking the dinner. She said to him, “Where was it”, and he said, “Your Majesty, it was only in the outer courtyard”, and he went on cooking the dinner.

That afternoon the King and Queen went to the east end of London to see how their neighbours had fared. When the Queen found that they had fared worse than she had—many had lost their houses and their furniture—she went back to Buckingham Palace and sent six van-loads of furniture which she could spare to Mrs. Brown and Mrs. O’Connor in the east end of London. Since then, whenever there has been devastation in any town, the King and Queen have very soon been there to comfort the sufferers and encourage the helpers.

I have put around the tables to-day a letter which was given to me by Major Cole in Ottawa and which he had received from a business friend of his whose business building is just near the Bank of England and the Guildhall in the city, and it gives the account of the city men going back after that night of the fire. Do read it—it is worth reading how those, shall we say, hard-headed business men wept when they saw what London was, what had happened to their beloved Guildhall. It is a good letter. Major Cole had it copied and put up in Ottawa in their offices, and I begged for a copy to bring here to you to-day.

I have also had a letter from a friend of mine telling of a girl of nineteen who had driven a canteen that same night, the night of the fire in London, from midnight till dawn. She said it was rather terrible but that only three days afterward the Queen came and thanked her.

They are not afraid of death in London. Death has got to come to us all. We can't put it off and it doesn't seem to matter much when it comes or how it comes. Nobody has ever said it was worse to be killed by a bomb than to be killed by cancer in your bed. Only, don't be afraid of anything.

The other effect in London, besides the abolishing of fear, is the increase in kindness. Hitler has broken the Golden Rule but by the very fact that he has killed kindness wherever he rules he has made the rest of us more kind. There are such opportunities for kindness everywhere and in London everyone is helping everybody else. There is no distinction of persons, there is no distinction of place. If your house is bombed you go to somebody else's house.

I was struck by what Metaxas, the Greek Premier, said to his people, "Freedom is life, death is only an episode."

Winston, our great and wonderful Winston—and this great war has thrown up two very great men—Winston and Roosevelt—and what Winston is to England at this time it is very difficult for anyone to express. If he came to

us to-day and said, "Look here, I want all your money," we should give it, and we should say, "Yes, and what else?" He is absolutely, entirely trusted. There is no fear. All he has promised us in answer to that is that death and sorrow will be the companions of our journey, hardship our garment, constancy and valour our only shield.

I want to quote the words of these two great men to each other. Roosevelt to Winston:

Sail on, O ship of state;
Sail on, O union strong and great.
Humanity with all its fears,
With all the hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate.

And Winston to Roosevelt:

"Put your confidence in us. Give us your faith and your blessing and under Providence all will be well.

"We shall not fail or falter; we shall not weaken or tire. Neither the sudden shock of battle nor the long drawn trials of vigilance and exertion will wear us down. Give us the tools and we will finish the job."

As we go on, death from the air in all its fury is striking at our sons and daughters, at our brothers and sisters in London. By day and by night, unceasingly, bombs are being hurled at them. A service was to be held in Westminster Abbey. The sirens' warning came so the King and Queen were told not to come, not for their safety, but because where the King and Queen move there is apt to be a crowd, and a crowd in dangerous. The Dean said, "What shall we do?" "Let us carry on," the Prime Minister said, and he walked into that fortress of stone which is the Abbey. The sirens wailed, the services began and they closed with a prayer by the Dean, and I want to read that prayer, if you will forgive me, because it is a prayer for the young men who are watching up there and the young men who are watching down there. We hear a great deal about the young men up in the air but not so much in detail about the young men under the water.

I remember in the last war I had a nephew in a submarine and he used to come back and cheer us with tales

of how pleasant it was to sit and see the German ships overhead, and he didn't really mind when he stayed down overlong, because the men all got jaundice and he got the sardines, and his cheery point of view made one feel when he didn't come back that it wasn't really sad, it was what he wanted.

Here is the prayer:

"Remember, O God, for their good, those watchmen who by night and by day climb into the air, as well as those who watch from under the sea: Let Thy left hand lead them, we beseech Thee, and Thy right hand hold them; and grant that faithfully and fearlessly, in conflict or in calm, they may do the work entrusted to them through Jesus Christ, our Lord."

I should like to add, if I may, two sentences. The first is that Winston Churchill takes off his hat to every woman he meets in uniform. Somebody said he must have a busy time.

The other is this: Do drink the new toast, the new toast of England "to the Navy, the Army, the Air Force and the Citizens of London." (Applause.)

MR. W. EASON HUMPHREYS: On your behalf, I should like to ask Major Vincent Price, President of the English-Speaking Union, to thank Mrs. Dimsdale.

MAJOR VINCENT PRICE: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: May I first of all, on behalf of the members of the English-Speaking Union, and the other organizations represented at this function, extend to you, Sir, and the Committee of the Empire Club, our very sincere thanks for having the opportunity to attend this very delightful function this afternoon. It is appropriate, perhaps, that the members of the English-Speaking Union should come to such a function as this to hear the inspiring address that we have heard to-day, because whether those among our members come from the Old Land, or whether they are members of the English-Speaking Union of Australia, or New Zealand or anywhere throughout

the United States of America, they realize to-day, Sir, that this struggle in which we are engaged is a supreme effort for the salvation of civilization and those of us who are here to-day appreciate the opportunity of hearing what Mrs. Marcus Dimsdale has said.

It seems to me that the two outstanding things which we carry away from this address this afternoon, this stirring address and so sincere in its message are, first of all, the abolition of fear. Fear has gone. And, second, the increasing of kindness in the people of London, and to Mrs. Dimsdale we are deeply indebted for the message which she has brought us in such a splendid and sincere way.

I notice in the public buildings of Toronto and in many other places, including the street cars, a quotation printed in large type which gives the very famous lines of His Majesty, the King, uttered some time ago: "This time we are all in the front line." As has already been said to-day we in Canada are fortunate in not going through the sufferings which the brave people of London and the West of England are facing, but surely such an address as we have heard to-day, from one coming from the heart of the Empire, it seems to me should put new meaning in those words, Mr. Chairman, and while we are not in the front line, from the point of view of bombs and cannon, I suggest we must in this country realize we are in the front line so far as a united war effort is concerned.

I know, Mr. Chairman, that I am expressing the feeling of everyone here to-day in saying to Mrs. Marcus Dimsdale that we do appreciate her coming here. We are thrilled by this sincere and stirring message telling us what the people of London are doing and I hope that this message will spread across Canada and enable and cause all of us from the Atlantic to the Pacific to go ahead as we have not gone ahead up to date, in doing our part to see that the struggle ends in the only way it can end, and that is in complete victory. May I, on behalf of this gathering, Sir, tender to our speaker our very sincere thanks and appreciation. (Applause.)

"CANADA AT THE CROSSROADS"

AN ADDRESS BY

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL GEORGE A. DREW,
K.C., M.L.A.

Chairman: The First Vice-President, Mr. C. R. Sanderson.

Thursday, March 6, 1941

MR. C. R. SANDERSON: It would be an impertinence to pretend to introduce Colonel Drew to the audience which is present in this room, or to the audience that is listening to us over the air. For twelve months he, himself, sat in the Presidential Chair which I occupy to-day through the unavoidable absence of the Honourable G. Howard Ferguson. And as President of this Club, Colonel Drew was a distinguished President in a long line of distinguished Presidents. In the Empire Club he is therefore among friends who will always be grateful for what he did when he guided its destiny. But he also comes as the Leader of His Majesty's Loyal Opposition in the Province of Ontario, bringing the experience of a distinguished political career, a career which holds still greater things in store.

May I read you the official announcement: We welcome to the place of honour, with great pleasure, a former President and an ardent supporter of the Club. Frank at all times and never hesitating to declare and to stand by his convictions, George Drew may well be described as an outstanding figure in Government and professional circles, and his definition of Canada's position at this critical period should prove to be of compelling interest.

Gentlemen, I give you George A. Drew; his subject, "Canada at the Crossroads." (Applause.)

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL GEORGE A. DREW, K.C., M.L.A.: Gentlemen: You have paid me a very gracious tribute indeed by asking me to speak again to the Empire Club of which I am a member and with which I have been associated in so many ways and for so many years.

To-day I will not attempt to follow any prescribed formula for entertaining you at the outset by something humorous. I am going to take the time which is perhaps all too short—for you it may be all too long—to discuss a subject which I think is the most important subject we Canadians have to think about at this time.

In the past few years I have discussed a number of subjects before this Club. Some of you will remember that when I spoke here after returning from Germany in 1935 I chose as the title of my speech, "Germany Prepares for Conquest." You may recall that I predicted on that occasion events which, unfortunately, came all too true. In some quarters I was then branded as a war-monger.

In 1937 I gave you my impressions following a visit to Russia and expressed the conviction that we could expect no good from that cruel and incompetent dictatorship. On that occasion some thought I gave a prejudiced picture. The illusion of a Socialist Paradise was still in many people's minds.

I spoke to you again on March 16th, 1938, three years ago now, almost to the day, and I would like to quote just a few words from that speech: "What is the use of asking ourselves what we shall do if war is declared? War has been declared. We are at war now and that war is going to determine whether civilization or barbarism is to predominate."

When I made that statement a year and a half before the outbreak of the present war, I was again criticized as an alarmist.

I refer to these incidents without apology only because they offer a suggestion that coming events do cast their shadows before them and that it is possible to predict events if one has been placed in a position to see the shadows.

To-day I am going to enter the dangerous field of prophecy again. I am going to speak of this Canada of ours and may I say again, with the utmost earnestness, that there is no subject of more concern to us at the present time. I have had the good fortune to visit almost every part of this vast country, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from the United States border to the Arctic. I firmly believe that no country in the whole world can offer such opportunities to its people as Canada can to-day. We have only started to employ the almost limitless resources at our disposal. There are unexplored frontiers of development in all directions still beckoning to our youth. Agriculture, industry, the mines, the forests, fishing, transportation by air, land and water, the production of power, the research professions, all these and many other fields of activity are wide open for young men and women of courage and vision who will employ the lessons of science and find the way to make new things from old materials. Science is the key which will unlock the door to peace and security. There are few limits to the opportunities open to the youth of Canada if we only organize efficiently for the future.

Do some craven souls suggest that the days of great opportunity in Canada are gone? If so, let them just think of a simple Canadian boy who was raised on an Ontario farm, who received only the state-supported education which is available to every citizen of this province, and then with dogged courage and sublime faith won the affection and admiration of the whole world by discoveries in the field of medical research which have been of help to all mankind. Let any Canadian who doubts the future and questions the spirit of our people think of Sir Frederick Banting, the Canadian farm boy from Alliston who won the respect of Kings and Statesmen. He died as he lived, in the service of humanity, but his spirit lives and will continue to live among us. His is the spirit which must not die in Canada. It is the spirit which will carry us through to victory and make Canada a great and prosperous nation in the years to come. His life should be a

shining lesson to all of us, and particularly to our youth. Victory, success and happiness are not won by wishing. That is what he would tell us to-day. He would tell us also that success is invariably the result of unselfish co-operation and co-ordination of the combined skill of all who work together. He would remind us that his discovery of insulin was made possible only by the whole-hearted unity of purpose which actuated his great associates—Best, Collip and Macleod.

That lesson is in fact the most important lesson which has emerged from this war. Wavell's smashing victories in Africa were the result of perfect co-ordination between all branches of the Service. Our failure in Norway and later the French collapse were mainly attributable to the lack of co-ordinated effort. Had the Navy or the Army or the Air Force struck separately in North Africa, then probably the Italians would still be holding the ports along the North African coast, but they struck together and their combined might overcame armies which had, in fact, been preparing to attack them within eight days.

We failed in the last war at Gallipoli because of lack of co-ordination. The ships went first and then, too late, came the Army. We succeeded in North Africa in these past few months because all our strength was pooled to give the greatest result. That, Gentlemen, I repeat, is the outstanding lesson of this war—Co-ordination.

The motto of this Club recognizes that principle. You know the words—"Canada in a United Empire." This Club has reason for pride in the effort which it has made year after year to stimulate in Canada the sentiment which is needed to make those words come true. We need have no concern about the unity of the Empire to-day. Never in the life of any one now living was there so much reason to be proud that we Canadians can call ourselves British. A truly united Empire stands proudly and gallantly, as the front line of civilization, accepting the responsibility and prepared to make the necessary sacrifices.

Canada will play her part in that grim test which lies

ahead. I believe implicitly in our ultimate victory. I cannot believe that treachery, lies, deceit and barbarism can extinguish the strong flame of freedom, no matter how terrifying their scientific organization may appear at this moment. But victory will call for sacrifices such as we have not yet been prepared to contemplate. That sacrifice will, I am certain, create a bond of sympathy and of understanding between the people of the British Empire throughout the whole world which will bring us closer together than we have ever been in the past.

I am not concerned at all about the unity of the British Empire. I am very much concerned, however, about unity within Canada itself. I am not at all sure that we have not reached a point in our national affairs when it might be considered necessary to adopt a new motto—"A United Canada in a United British Empire."

It cannot be said too often that this is a war of ideas, just as much as it is a war of weapons. Out of the stern crucible of this ghastly war, nations will emerge, clean and strong, or the very opposite, depending on whether or not the national components have been fused into a strong and indestructible mass by the intense heat of the struggle, or have become separated through lack of inherent affinity.

We have been warned in Canada of the danger of complacency, but there is a particular form of complacency about which we should be much more concerned than we have been in the past. We have recognized the increasing difficulty of efficient government in a country where the conflict of authority between the Federal and Provincial Governments has created a complete impasse in many fields of legislation. We know, or should know, that we are the most over-governed nation in the whole world. I say that without reservation of any kind. We know, or should know, that we have more Cabinet Ministers and Members of Parliament per capita than any other democratic nation in the whole world.

Legislation for the security and protection of our workers, for the efficient marketing of our products and

for the general improvement of the social conditions of our people still awaits enactment simply because we have not found some formula for overcoming the inexcusable confusion which exists. Other nations, not nearly so prosperous as we are, have passed such laws. We know such laws should be passed. We know sooner or later they must be passed. Some, you will remember, were placed on our Statute Books and then were held to be unconstitutional because our governments could not find any basis for agreement.

In spite of all this confusion there has been a complacent assumption that everything will solve itself in the course of time. Now we are up against stern reality. We are up against the sternest reality this nation has ever faced. The time has come to realize that we are in less danger of national bankruptcy as a result of the enormous expenditures on this war, than we are from the disorganization and confusion which exists in the business relationships between the Dominion and Provincial Governments.

Please don't misunderstand me. I have no intention whatever of criticizing those responsible for past mistakes or of tracing the source of our present difficulties. We are all to blame. I intend to point out what those difficulties are and to suggest certain things which must be done with the greatest possible speed.

First of all, I wish to discuss some aspects of our constitutional position which may sound rather academic, but I believe an understanding of the constitutional problem is vitally necessary if the extreme urgency of the situation is to be understood. The British North America Act, which is the framework supporting our national structure, defined the legislative authority of the Dominion and Provincial Governments. It was intended that the Dominion Government should deal with all matters of national concern and that the Provincial Governments should deal with matters of purely local concern in the different provinces. One particular authority was given to the Dominion Government and another particular authority given to the Provincial Governments, which have had a very profound

effect upon our national affairs and upon our present difficulties.

The right to pass legislation dealing with property and civil rights was one of the exclusive powers conferred upon the Provincial Governments. An examination of the discussion, which took place prior to Confederation makes it perfectly clear that this was merely intended to provide for enactments relating to the ordinary civil and property rights of the people of Ontario. It was never thought for a moment that this provision would be a vehicle by which the Provincial Governments would obtain new and sweeping powers. But as time went on and the simple life of 1867 passed into memory, a new and more complicated system of living emerged and questions arose in regard to business and financial activities which had not even been dreamed of at the time this Act was passed.

Unfortunately Provincial Governments claimed the right to legislate in these new fields, contending that they came within the broad definition of property and civil rights. Many appeals were taken to the Privy Council and a wider and wider interpretation of this provision added wider and wider powers to the Provincial Governments. Many of the most serious difficulties we now face are the result of an extremely generous interpretation of this somewhat vague provision.

Through the course of all this constitutional litigation the Provincial authorities seemed to forget more and more that the Dominion Government was the creature of their own choice. To hear the arguments of some of the exponents of provincial rights you would think that the rights of the provinces were hard-won rights, obtained from an unwilling, superior authority. That state of mind has a great deal to do with our difficulties.

In 1867 the British Colonies of North America each had their own legislative powers. Subject to such control as was exercised from London, they were independent legislative bodies. Rights were not given to them grudgingly by some government superior to their own. The men who met in the conferences prior to Confederation

decided of their own free will that the welfare of the British people of North America would be best served by limiting the activities of the Provincial Governments to purely local matters and making it possible for the Dominion Government to legislate effectively in regard to all matters of national concern.

That is something which should be remembered and should have been remembered throughout the years when petty officialdom sought to increase its authority, as petty officialdom always does. And that is something which should be vividly in our minds to-day. The attitude undoubtedly developed that the provinces were protecting their own rights by insisting upon increasing decentralization. By a process directly opposed to the purpose and spirit of Confederation every Provincial Government continued to increase its powers to the point where it might be extremely difficult at times for a stranger to Canada to know whether he was in one nation or in nine.

So much for the years of peace. When war comes the trend is immediately reversed. The other important provision to which I referred then comes into effect. It was provided in the British North America Act that the Dominion Government should have authority to pass laws for the peace, order and good government of Canada. Again the Courts have played their part. It has been held that this provision makes it possible for the Dominion Government to assume all powers necessary for the most effective prosecution of the war. That authority was invoked to an extremely limited extent prior to the Great War. Then in 1914 the War Measures Act was passed under that provision. Such powers as were assumed by the Dominion Government during the last war came to an end with the termination of hostilities, but when the present war began the same Act was still on the Statute Books. Its powers again became operative and immediately Orders-in-Council were passed, under its sweeping provisions, of a much more far-reaching character than any we had known before.

Then last year the Mobilization Act was passed, so

general in its terms that it gives the Dominion Government power to control almost every phase of our daily life by Order-in-Council, without regard to any limitations in the British North America Act. Under this Act the Dominion Government can control the man-power as well as the industrial and agricultural activity of Canada, and any other activities which may be interpreted as playing some part in the prosecution of the war.

Under these two Acts I think it is perfectly clear that the Dominion Government has full power to occupy any field of legislation and any field of taxation which has any bearing whatever upon the effective prosecution of this war. Already they have set up Control Boards dealing with what would ordinarily be property and civil rights, such as the control of fuel, gasoline, fuel oil, timber, hydro-electric power and so on. Prices of agricultural products have been fixed and limits set upon industrial profits. A control has been placed upon rents and upon other obviously property rights. All of these things would ordinarily fall under the exclusive control of the Provincial Government.

This is probably only a beginning. It is not necessary for us to argue as to whether this situation is wise or unwise. It is the law. It is the situation we face whether we like it or not. That being so, what utter nonsense it is to talk of the danger of losing provincial rights. Provincial rights have to all intents and purposes been suspended for the duration of the war. Of course when the war is over these sweeping powers will disappear, but let us think of what might happen then. We will have created a great and intricate supervising structure, occupying almost every field of agricultural, industrial and economic activity. Can you imagine the chaos that would follow if immediately after the termination of war all these controls, all these guiding Boards and Committees set up during the war were suddenly swept away, and nothing was ready to take their place? There would be chaos.

That is the dangerous possibility which lies ahead

unless we face the situation as it is now. To-morrow—to-day—the Dominion Government can take full control by Order-in-Council, without public discussion or notice of any kind, of gasoline or liquor. It can also decide that it is necessary for the effective prosecution of the war to enter various fields of taxation and make them available only to the Dominion Government. You may say, well this won't happen. But it has happened. It has happened already in almost every other country now at war. The simple truth is that no matter what the intention of the original British North America Act was, it is clear from the judicial decisions interpreting the authority of the Dominion Government in the last war that the Dominion Government has full power now to do everything except affect the most personal relationships of the individual, such as the solemnization of marriage, and so on.

What a pitiful waste of time it is in the face of these facts to boast of the preservation of the sovereign authority of the Provincial Governments. For the duration of this war, long or short, the sovereign rights of the provinces depend entirely upon the extent to which the Dominion Government is prepared to recognize them.

It seems to me that this makes it perfectly obvious that none of the Provincial Governments can prepare a budget which is anything but the wildest guess unless there is some working arrangement with the Dominion Government in regard to the probable course of action for the ensuing year. The most substantial items in the budgets of all the provinces are the revenues from the sale of gasoline and liquor. I have already pointed out that the Dominion might ration or curtail the use of either of these sources of revenue at any time. The Dominion Government may find it necessary to do so. I can't see how it will be possible to avoid doing so at some point in this war.

I hope you will not accuse me of being an alarmist when I point out that steps which may become necessary in the opinion of the Dominion Government could put all the Provincial Governments into virtual bankruptcy. The

provinces might conceivably suddenly find their available sources of revenue cut to a half of the expenditures to which they were committed by action which the Dominion Government found absolutely necessary for the successful prosecution of the war.

It may seem unlikely this will happen. But it can and may happen. Surely that is a state of confusion and uncertainty which should not be permitted to continue a day longer. And yet this financial uncertainty is only one of the problems which confronts us as a result of the effect of the war upon our constitutional system of government. Let us examine some of the others.

For the first time since Canada became a nation we have practically no normal foreign markets for our agricultural products. The Dominion Government has found it necessary to control the distribution and the sale of our most valuable agricultural supplies. For the first time the farmers of Canada are living under what has been generally known as "a controlled economy." But our farmers find themselves in this extremely unfortunate position. The method of distribution and sale is controlled, an increase in prices in certain lines is strictly limited, and yet there is no effective plan for the maintenance of adequate prices for the general run of agricultural products. Now, surely a controlled economy implies just control from the source to the consuming point. Surely it is obvious that where the method of distribution and the sale price is under control there must be not only control of the price but also maintenance of the price level right to the source. This can only be done by the Dominion Government if it is prepared to encroach fully upon the clearly defined authority of the Provincial Governments. As I have pointed out, it can take that authority, but there are obvious reasons, having regard to future goodwill, why it is unlikely that it would do so. That being so, there is urgent need for some working arrangement between the Dominion and Provincial Governments which will co-ordinate the handling of agricultural products right from the producer to the consumer,

if there is to be any control at all, in such a way that while exploitation is prevented a fair return is also assured. That, it seems to me, is the least that can be expected.

Then let us look at the position of labour. Factory conditions, hours of work and terms of employment are ordinarily under the exclusive control of the Provincial Government. Under the Mobilization Act, however, full control of all matters affecting labour may be assumed by the Dominion Government under Order-in-Council, without any prior public discussion. That being so, labour has no way of knowing what rights it has from day to day. That is a disadvantage to every one of us, and not only to the workers. The history of the last war and the history of the present war has shown the importance in Great Britain of maintaining the confidence of labour by assuring adequate protection of their just rights. No part of the Canadian public can be more quickly and adversely affected by the changes of war than the workers in our factories. To-day their position is one of the greatest possible uncertainty. That can only be cured by some understanding again between the Provincial Governments, which ordinarily pass laws to control their rights, and the Dominion Government which now has the power to vary those rights in any way it deems advisable.

The most serious problem of all, however, from the long range point of view is that of creating some effective plan for the rehabilitation of veterans of this war and the re-employment of men and women now in war industries who will be thrown out of work when peace comes. Surely the recollection of the tragic years which have passed, when thousands of the finest young men in the world wandered aimlessly about Canada seeking only the right to work, is too fresh in our memory for it to be necessary to lay too much stress on what will happen after this war is over, if efficient and comprehensive plans are not in readiness to be put into immediate effect once peace is signed.

History teaches us only too clearly what happens in nations where men who have been serving in the army

and have been working in war industries find that peace brings only despair, simply because their leaders did not have enough vision to plan for the inevitable readjustment which must come with peace.

There is much to be done in Canada. I haven't the time to go into further detail. I hope I have said enough. We must start planning for the post-war employment now. We must provide for these members of our armed forces and our munition workers who will be thrown out of work the moment that which we most desire comes to pass. Some twenty thousand men already have been discharged from our armed forces and many of them are now seeking employment. That number will increase rapidly as time goes on. This is not some vague need of the future. The need is urgent. It is with us now.

What is the answer to these urgent problems? I think it is clear. All I can do is offer my suggestion, whether you agree with the suggestion or not. I believe that this critical situation can be dealt with by joint discussion between representatives of the different governments of this country, and in no other way.

Never mind who was to blame for anything that has happened in the past. We have all too little time to prepare for the future. The past is past and the present is moving rapidly away from us.

There should be an immediate conference between representatives from the Dominion and Provincial Governments and it should take place right away. It should not wait until after the present Dominion Session is finished. You may say they are too busy. I don't think so. The successful waging of the war is our first consideration, but our domestic situation must not be ignored. It is in fact the foundation upon which our war effort must be based. It may be too late to deal with many of these problems if we don't act soon. The first conference need not take up a great deal of time. We are not going to create a new world over night. The first conference need not take more than a few days. This country became a nation in 1867 as the result of the adoption of a resolution defining the

principles upon which the different British colonies were prepared to work together. I know there are those who say "Oh, what do resolutions mean? They are just words." That is true but every job starts with words of some kind. No successful action ever started except with some fundamental basis for that action. Some such definition of principle is the only basis upon which any conference can succeed.

The first step, then, in such a conference of representatives of the governing bodies would seem to be a simple formula for overcoming our present difficulties. The simpler it is, the better. Once that formula is adopted there should be no great difficulty for men of good will to establish a basis of priority for the consideration of the various problems which must be discussed. The most urgent, the most pressing, should be dealt with immediately.

Looking at the situation as a business proposition, I have this suggestion to offer for what it is worth. I believe that out of such a conference there should be formed an Inter-Governmental Planning Committee. The duties of that Committee should be, in my opinion, to work upon plans for the co-ordination of our various domestic inter-governmental activities. This should be a continuing Committee and might well consist of one member from the Cabinet of each of the ten Governments. The very existence of such a Planning Committee would do much to create the spirit of co-operation which is so obviously lacking in Canada to-day. Co-operation in government or business does not depend so much upon written agreements or written words as it does upon the desire to co-operate. I would be inclined to think that such a conference as I have suggested need do no more at the first meeting than adopt a general formula, such as that which was the basis of Confederation, and then proceed to set up an Inter-Governmental Planning Committee, or some similar body to start work on plans in accordance with that simple formula. Then, the conference could adjourn to meet again at the call of the Chairman of the Planning Com-

mittee at such time as their first plans would be ready for consideration. In this way the basis would be established for continuous consultation and discussion which is so vitally necessary.

Our present course along the line of increasing decentralization can only lead to national disintegration. We must find some way for reversing our course and bringing order out of chaos. Whether I have offered the right solution or not, at least it is an attempt to suggest a way back along the path of national unity.

It seems to me that we must be prepared to face this issue now and to talk about it so that others may know what we are thinking. There must be some rationalization of our utterly irrational jig-saw puzzle of government. Unless we find some way to break through the administrative deadlock created by the meaningless bottlenecks of legislative authority, we are headed for disaster, no matter how complete our military victory may be. An old comfortable world is crumbling before our eyes. Only a few warning cracks may appear on the surface at the moment but mighty forces have been set free which are tearing it to pieces and the job of our generation is to build anew a better and a more helpful world from the wreckage of the old. And it can be done. It can be done here in Canada with greater success perhaps than any place else in the world if we will only adopt sound business methods of government and work together as we have never worked together before.

You may ask why I am discussing this here. You may say that these are things to discuss in the ten Parliaments of Canada. I believe that these are things for all the people of Canada to discuss. These are the things for the people of Canada to demand. Your elected representatives are not your representatives only on election day. They are your representatives all the time. You have a right to tell them what you want done. You have more than a right, you have a duty. Unless that duty is performed, those who have been sent to the ten different Governments to

represent you have no way of correctly interpreting what your thoughts are .

The Empire Club has done much to stimulate a spirit of Empire unity. I believe there is an equal need to-day for the stimulation of a spirit of Canadian unity. But this is not a task for a few people who happen to be members of parliament. This is a task for every Canadian. I think that it is most necessary that your voices should be heard. You should say what you think, for or against proposals of this kind. That is the only way that democracy can really work.

I close as I began. We have two courses before us and only two. We are at the greatest crossroads in our history. Along one road lies disunity and unhappiness. Along the other lies strength and prosperity. If we permit the present sectionalism and disunity to continue, dangerous days lie before us. If, on the other hand, a clear demand is heard on all sides for unity and good will then that demand can and must find expression in appropriate action. If we start to work together with the same unselfish spirit which inspired our forefathers prior to Confederation, then Canada will emerge from this war strong and powerful in spite of all its efforts and its heavy sacrifices. If the regenerating force of national unity is fully aroused then you and I will be able to say to our children with confidence, that this country offers to them opportunities greater than are offered by any other country in the whole world.

MR. C. R. SANDERSON: Gentlemen, we have just listened to a brilliant address which, if possible, should have been left without an after-word. Not only was it a comprehensive survey of Canadian affairs, not only was it a placing of Canadian problems in their historical projection so they can be more clearly understood, it was a definite offering of concrete suggestions toward the solution of those problems. Throughout the address too, there was an underlying faith and optimism which is encouraging and stimulating, a faith and an optimism which

are fully justified because we have in Canada the will to understand, the will to adjust, the will to co-operate and compromise, of which Colonel Drew has spoken.

Sir, on behalf of The Empire Club of Canada, and on behalf of our radio audience, may I express to you our deep debt of gratitude for your having given us so much of your time and for having put so much into an address, almost every sentence of which had a thought of its own and could stand alone. (Applause.)

"WHAT IS NOW AT STAKE IN EUROPE"

AN ADDRESS BY

HERBERT L. STEWART, M.A., Ph.D., F.R.S.C.

PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY, DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY.

Chairman: The Third Vice-President, Mr. E. F.
Thompson.

Thursday, March 13, 1941

MR. E. F. THOMPSON: The Empire Club to-day desires to pay honour to one of Toronto's sons, Flight-Lieutenant Lawrence Wilkins Skey. (Applause.) Flight-Lieutenant Skey is the first Toronto pilot to win the Distinguished Flying Cross. (Applause.) This was awarded to him for services rendered in a patrol on the North Sea and was given for astounding endurance and courage. I am sure you would all like to have a word from Flight-Lieutenant Skey, D.F.C.

FLIGHT-LIEUTENANT SKEY, D.F.C. (upon rising to his feet was greeted with prolonged applause): Mr. President and Gentlemen: I must say this is the finest thing that has happened to me since I left England last, including many very pleasant experiences, but to come home and to be welcomed as I have been since I arrived here has made me very happy, and I have met all my friends again and come back to my family, and I really feel as if this is the biggest moment of my life.

I would like to be able to tell you to-day some of the stories that come through on the grape vine, you might say on the Royal Air Force, because our news is censored heavily in the Old Country, but they will all be written some day, they will be written far better than I can tell

them to you, and I would like to leave the feats of courage and bravery of such men as Cain, Darwin, Leroy and Hanna for better men than I to deal with; but I would like to tell you just one story, the story of an airman. His name was O'Reilly. He was an Irishman, serving under a Canadian officer in a Welsh crew, with a Scotch observer. Now that is the type of crew and company that is making up the Air Force to-day, and that is, I really think, making world history.

Now O'Reilly was sitting in an aircraft at his gun post. He had been there for hours, and it was a most important patrol, and enemy action, the possibility of enemy action had been signalled to the air craft, and there were enemy fighters out, and everything looked as if it might be zero. Well the captain of the boat went aft to check over his gun position, and he saw O'Reilly sitting beside his machine-gun, and he was trembling, shaking in every limb. The captain thought, this is no good, I can't have a gunner who is frightened to death: it will ruin the morale. He tapped him on the arm and said: "You go below for a while, O'Reilly, and get a cup of tea. I will take your gun." O'Reilly turned to him and said, "But, Sir, this is my gun," and he would not desert his post under any circumstances.

Now it is men like this man, like O'Reilly, that are making history to-day, not the men that are in the lime-light—the men that are on the ground, that are building the aircraft, maintaining them, and working with all their strength and suffering as much enemy action as the men who go up to fight, because they are being bombed on the ground and they are being harassed and strafed by machine-gun fire, and they are the men that are making this Air Force that is getting so much publicity, go. It is men like O'Reilly who won't desert their guns, it is an Empire crew that produces men like this.

Now some of these men don't even know what they are fighting for, and Mr. Kennedy, the United States Ambassador, was right when he said the English have not been told what they are fighting for yet, and if they were

asked they possibly would not know. But some of them know: they are fighting for their homes now, they are fighting for their traditions and they are fighting bitterly withal; they are fighting bitterly because they feel that they have been let down. They have been let down by the leaders who went ten years before them and failed to stop this thing that is with us now, this thing that men like O'Reilly have to see through. And I would like to appeal to you men here to-day who are leaders in this community and ask you to read the article written by Mr. Horace T. Hunter, the speech which he gave to the meeting of the Toronto Bank. It is in the March 15th issue of McLean's, and he has put these words to you far better than I could to-day, "We are suffering from dearth of leadership." And these men have suffered and will suffer and will die for that.

Now let us see if Canada can give this leadership to our Empire. England is wrapped in the arms of her opponent now, she can't think or feel beyond the grip that is on her. But over here I have seen more enlightenment more straight thinking and more real understanding of what this war means and what we have got to face in it, with it, and after it, and I think this country is coming into a tradition, a tradition that Sir Wilfrid Laurier gave them, "The twentieth century belongs to Canada."

I think it is from places like Toronto, from Montreal, from places like our great West, that we are going to find leaders in the future, who won't let down the men that are fighting now—what is it our British Prime Minister said?—"on the beaches, on the streets, on the farms, on the roads, we will fight to the last man." And they will do that, you may depend on it.

And in closing, I would just like to read you a bit of Tennyson,

"When I dipt into the future as far as human eye
could see,
Saw the vision of the world and all the wonder
that would be.

Saw the heavens fill with commerce, argosies of
magic sails,
Pilots of the purple twilight, dropping down with
costly bales;

Heard the heavens fill with shouting, and there
rain'd a ghastly dew
From the nations' airy navies grappling in the
central blue;

Far along the world-wide whisper of the south-
wind rushing warm,
With the *standards of the peoples* plunging thro
the thunder-storm;

Till the war-drum throb'd no longer, and the
battle-flags were furl'd
In the *Parliament of man, the Federation of the
world.*" (Applause.)

MR. E. F. THOMPSON: Lieutenant Skey, on behalf of the Empire Club, I desire to thank you very much.

Gentlemen, our Speaker of to-day needs no introduction to an Empire Club audience. He has been our guest on several occasions in the past, and we are delighted to have him here with us again to-day.

Likewise, to our radio audience he needs no introduction. His voice is known in every home as one of Canada's greatest commentators on to-day's news. Without any further introduction, I give you Dr. Herbert L. Stewart, who will talk to us to-day on the subject: "What is Now at Stake in Europe."

HERBERT L. STEWART, M.A., Ph.D., F.R.S.C.: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Empire Club of Canada: It was with special pleasure that I accepted your invitation to come and speak to you again this afternoon, at a time of Empire emergency. Memories of a previous visit which

I greatly enjoyed are very vivid in my mind, and I am honoured to know from some of my friends who have mentioned it to me that it has not completely passed out of their recollection either. I thank you most sincerely for the warmth of this welcome, and for the very kind words in which I have been introduced.

The time is indeed one, as Mr. Churchill has said, to act rather than to speak. And yet, for our mutual encouragement just now, for the high resolve and enduring fortitude from which action comes, we have surely need to exchange thought frequently and earnestly, about what it is we are aiming to do. I was deeply impressed by the words of the Flight-Lieutenant who has just addressed us and who emphasized that aspect of the situation. In this, as in so many other respects, the British Prime Minister sets the supreme example to his countrymen.

In a sense, indeed, the time for discussion has passed. We know what has to be done, and there is no real room for controversy or debate, except about the most effective method of doing it. Some have seen in that somewhat obvious reflection ground for the calling of a moratorium upon speeches and conferences of a character to which we have long been accustomed. They urge that war method is a problem for small groups of experts—experts in national defence, in factory organization, in financial adjustment—to settle among themselves with a minimum of talk; the sort of problems on which speech-making to a large audience can contribute less than nothing. There is force in that; we know that there is. The Empire is fighting for its life, and every other consideration in the world must be postponed, must give place, to considerations of the technique for victory.

But, Gentlemen, in this war, beyond any other war of which we have knowledge, it seems to me that the technique of victory requires constant, insistent, well-planned operation upon the public mind. Influences are at work, some of them designed, others accidental, to create obscurity and confusion as to the purposes for which the war is being fought. You can see that very conspicuously in

enemy tactics. He who does not realize the extraordinary difference as compared with experiences in the past, the development of publicity particularly through the agency of the air, as among the methods essential to winning wars, is courting a fate like that of some senior leaders in France who pinned their faith to the Maginot Line. The whole machinery of systematic deceit, which Nazis and Fascists have perfected under the name "propaganda" is there to show it. Here is the product of a cunning mind, which discerned how submarines and bombing planes and new chemical combinations are only part of the difference which the development of a generation has seen in the arts of war. Another change is in the subtler craftiness with which the public of all countries, now—through the medium of the air—so much more easily accessible than of old, can be subjected to varying types of imposture. To anyone, then, who asks "Why discuss further at this stage the fundamental issues at stake?" I reply: "Listen to the radio orators broadcasting from Berlin or Rome, from Hamburg or Milan. Observe the differences from week to week in that appeal not to experts but to the public. We must be ready to counter those propagandist artifices against us, artifices by no means stupid but often hatefully skilful, artifices for which it is sheer naive simplicity to cultivate mere contempt. That is why we must restate again and again, in terms changed with the changing situation, just what is at stake in Europe."

Fundamentally, what is at stake is our British heritage; all that this has meant in generations gone by, all that experience entitles us to expect from it in generations to come. Not, of course, the British heritage as distinguished from that of other free peoples—for example, from what Mr. Roosevelt so likes to call "the American way of life". But we think naturally in terms first of our national version of that heritage of freedom: the gospel of freedom as proclaimed in our British dialect, without prejudice to the American dialect, or the Scandinavian, or the Swiss. More and more clearly those who speak the different dialects are coming to realize that it is indeed a common

language, all the richer for its dialectical varieties. But we use it, in the first instance, each in his own form. It is of the British that I speak this afternoon. And there is no audience to which, on that subject, I would rather turn at such a time as this, to share confidences and fears, enthusiasm and misgiving, than to the Empire Club of Canada.

On my visit four years ago, I took as title for my talk "The Present Challenge to British Imperialism". That afternoon I tried to show how the authoritarian movement in Europe would sooner or later attempt destruction of the British Empire. The reasons for thinking so were not in any proof yet given by either Fascist Italy or Nazi Germany that such was her design. Many good publicists were calling it an idle fear. Readers were being reassured by optimistic, care-dispelling books such as Lord Londonderry's *Ourselves and Germany*, Mr. Ward Price's *I Knew These Dictators*, or Mr. Washburn Child's edition of Mussolini's *Autobiography*. From time to time the composure of Parliament was invaded by the incisive tones of Mr. Churchill, but his was an unusual if not an altogether lone voice of alarm.

Gentlemen, I shall probably surprise you when I say that I think those who refused four years ago to be alarmed were right so far as this—that neither Hitler nor Mussolini at that time had any project of attacking the British Empire. One British witness after another, in intimate touch with each of them, expressed the same serene confidence, and to my mind it is perfectly consistent with what has happened since to suppose that their judgment was correct. What was it, then, that changed the dictators? As I see it, they believed steadily, until about a year and a half ago, that they could get all they wanted elsewhere, in other countries, not indeed with the approval, but with the acquiescence of Great Britain, and such peaceful inexpensive pillaging of the continent of Europe had then enough attractions to content them. It was the summer of 1939 that produced a tremendous disillusionment of the dictatorial mind. The result was an

outburst of disappointment and rage, in which the policy of the authoritarian States was redrawn, so as to include, as it does now, the complete obliteration of the British Empire.

But even in 1936, while they still gave no sign that they purposed this, there was abundant reason to expect that they would sooner or later come to it. They had embarked on territorial expansion by methods which Great Britain could never tolerate, unless she had completely abandoned her historic guardianship both of international custom and of the balance of European power. The dictators thought that she could be induced to sacrifice both of these, partly to avoid the peril and the cost of fighting, partly to be left—as they were willing to leave her—undisturbed in her own possessions while others were being pillaged. They were convinced of this by the immunity they had enjoyed in certain experimental ventures with their new method. Emboldened by the success of the Japanese rape of Manchuria in 1931, Mussolini repeated it in all essentials and was rewarded with a like success, against Ethiopia in 1935. Contempt for covenants having triumphed twice, Germany in March 1936 ignored the Locarno Pact and re-militarized the Rhineland; this was no case of pardonable rebellion against a treaty such as that of Versailles which she had signed under constraint; it was the wanton violation of a treaty which her own leaders had exhausted every effort to secure and to which her seal had been set with enthusiasm. At length the theory of the procedure was being broadly hinted if not openly avowed—that these young and virile nations had but to show themselves resolute with their “New Order” and the effete, ageing Democracies would acquiesce rather than resist. The most daring development of the months just before that meeting of your Club in November 1936, was in the fierce broadcasts addressed in Arabic and Syriac from the Italian radio station at Bari to the tribesmen of Moslem countries, inflaming their resentment against British rule! That autumn we had been reading the reports of sharp remonstrance to Mussolini from the British Foreign Office regarding those Bari

broadcasts, and noting the manifest equivocation of the replies. Still, many of us were reluctant to suppose that a fight à *outrance* was contemplated. It is my own belief that it was not even then definitely intended, either at Berlin or at Rome, and that these offensive displays, which were indeed getting rapidly worse, were still meant to accumulate for diplomacy what is known elsewhere as mere "nuisance value".

Three years elapsed between that afternoon in the fall of 1936, when we talked about these perils, and the ever memorable September 3, 1939, when the storm burst. In that time every conceivable doubt about the clash of purpose was swept away.

Great Britain was even then slow, too slow, to accept the dire reality, and to act upon it. Her long deferring of rearmament, in at least one respect, did her honour. She would not believe in what came to be called "the ideological contrast", the essential wickedness of any group of powers, especially where the belief implied a high compliment to herself. Neville Chamberlain's anxiety to "appease" at least exemplified one good British quality, the quality of self-criticism, with a touch of self-suspicion. You remember how many mentors, during those years, bade us think of Britain's own possible faults; dwelt upon the harshness of the Treaty of Versailles, upon the unfulfilled pledge of general disarmament, upon the ungracious, inconsiderate attitude which—they said—had been adopted towards a moderate reformer like Stresemann or Brüning, and which had issued in German reaction to a Hitler.

We don't hear much of those explanations now. They have been exploded, not so much answered as rendered absurdly irrelevant by the action of Germany herself. What should puzzle us is to understand how, in even the keenest mood of self-criticism, they ever seemed adequate. Harshness in the Treaty of Versailles? The chief fault found with it was its neglect of racial self-determination, in assigning such considerable German blocks to Poland or to Czechoslovakia. How long had huge blocks of Slavs

been held under German dominance? If it was not possible to rearrange in strictly homogeneous groups, will anyone now argue, in the light of what Germany has been doing to Czechoslovakia and to Poland, that the Treaty-makers at Versailles did not choose the more just side for inevitable disproportion? Neglect of general disarmament, in contravention of a treaty pledge? There was no such treaty pledge, despite reiterated statement of what the Versailles document contains, made chiefly by those who never read it. There was nothing more in the famous Clause than the expression of a pious hope that general disarmament might be found possible, and of a resolve to promote it, as a cautious qualifying phrase added, "within the limits of national safety". Or the reproach that British inconsiderateness to a Stresemann produced enthusiasm in Germany for a Hitler? The truth is that Hitler rose to power not in days when his country was suffering from the rigour of her conquerors, but at a time when concession had followed concession; not when the severities of a Peace Treaty were most keenly felt, but after all its punitive severities had been remitted and only its safeguards for the future had been retained.

During those three years, 1936 to 1939, for even the charitably credulous, successive events had been deepening suspicion into certainty. First came the Nazi Pact with Japan. 1936 had not yet closed when von Ribbentrop flew from Berlin to Tokio, to cement the alliance of two nations with no interest in common, except their common substitution of violence and fraud for the earlier decencies of international procedure. When, in due course, Fascist Italy joined these two, the Pact of the trio was aptly named by some satirist, borrowing a phrase from Oscar Wilde, "the Confraternity of the Faithless". Succeeding months witnessed the imposture of Germany and Italy in common on the Spanish peninsula, the fraud called "Non-Intervention", about which I think the historian will some day be puzzled to tell whether it was a greater shame to the character of the Axis Powers which contrived it or to the intelligence of other Powers which somehow believed in it.

Perhaps, however, the term will at length have one significant use. Those Germans and Italians who are puzzled just now to guess what Mr. Roosevelt means by "Neutrality" may be invited to recall what they themselves, in those years 1936-1939, meant by "Non-Intervention"! In 1937, at least, the intention of dictators manoeuvring for bases so near Gibraltar had strained British trust to near its breaking point. The end of that year saw Japan's renewed onslaught on China, with the benediction of her triangle partners and the execration of everyone else. Already the purposes of the sinister trio were clear to any really searching mind, when they were put beyond doubt for any mind whatever by the sequence of 1938 and 1939—in the rape of Austria, the extinction of Czechoslovakia, and the unmistakable preparations for a like horror in Poland.

But, Gentlemen, though our Empire is indeed fighting for its life, though the seizure of its resources and the enslavement of its peoples are now plainly the master-purpose of Fascists and Nazis, it is not solely, it is not chiefly, a national cause that is at stake. This time, we have got "to finish it", said Neville Chamberlain, on September 3, 1939. He had not reached that decision hastily—perhaps he should have reached it sooner—but he reached it very definitely. And what was it that this intensely peace-loving Englishman in the end resolved to finish, though it should cost a World War to do it? Not a mere menace to British Imperial interests, but a menace to all that makes life worth living.

As I see it, what has to be finished includes three sinister elements. One thing we are in this war to end is *international blackmail*. For years Nazi Germany's policy abroad has been that of exacting concessions with the threat that otherwise she will perpetrate a world horror by which the humane will be excruciated while she herself, not being humane, will be entertained if not exhilarated. Ransom to this international pirate was paid, several times—in Austria, in Czechoslovakia, in Spain. It could not continue to be paid forever. Like other blackmailers this one at length went a stage too far. And once the

humane victim decided to resist, it was plain that resistance must be complete. The so-called "New Order", by which is meant, in plain English, international brigandage, has to be stopped, in the interest not of one people but of every people. Blackmail must be finished.

A second thing we are in the war to finish is the practice of international bad faith. At some coming happier time, the historian will record with amazement and disgust how in the second quarter of the twentieth century the progress of Christendom was for a time halted, the achievements of Christendom were for a time successfully reversed, by a chief bandit in Prussia bringing back the perfidies of Frederick the Great and another chief bandit in Italy starting again the diplomatic peculiarities of fifteenth century Italian republics. I suspect that the historian of a coming happier day will here be puzzled again: puzzled to say whether he is more shocked by the pirates who perpetrated all this or by the judgment of observers far away who sought for some mitigation—if not justification—by which to excuse it.

Gentlemen, there is a side to this, whose gravity is not yet realized. *The situation is demoralizing us all.* Any university teacher who, like myself, is in daily contact with undergraduates, can tell you how much already there is here to be undone. He can tell you how hard it now is to convince students whose adolescent lives have been passed wholly in the atmosphere which these dictators have befouled, that there ever was a time when Great Powers could trust one another's word, a time when a Pact or a Covenant was safely held to close a question, a time when international diplomacy had not yet become a synonym for international deceit. We of an older generation know that there was such a time. We know it because we lived in it. It was a time when the Great Powers could, in general, trust one another's contracts. They were slow to make a contract, far slower than they are now—and for an obvious reason. Every man in business has a certain increased confidence in a customer who takes time to drive a hard bargain—this at least suggests that there is a pur-

pose to carry it out—and those who bargain with no apparent hesitation at all are proportionately worth watching, especially in international affairs. But the young generation of students listen with scarcely concealed scepticism to those who, like myself, insist that there was, not so very long ago, a time of international dependability. They have heard from political scientists of subtle mind that in truth such Golden Age of diplomacy is a myth, that good faith in international relations was never more than a smoke-screen, an artifice by which the subtler deceived the more credulous negotiators. The great charm of many an historical course, in certain institutions of learning, has come to lie in such liberating of young minds from superstitions of the past. You know the sort of instructors I mean—approaching those who still retain belief that the horror of these times is abnormal (and hence possibly removable) much as a biologist might deal sympathetically but firmly with some still surviving “pre-Darwinian” simpleton. We must get rid of this nonsense of our intellectuals, this slander upon human nature, still more absurd in our contemporaries who reproduce it than it was in Thomas Hobbes, three centuries ago, from whom they have borrowed it. Somehow such mood of paralytic scepticism must be dispelled, if our world is not to collapse in ruin. We are in this war to repair the moral breaches, intolerable not to any single national interest but to all interests. We are fighting to put an end to international bad faith, and—as a first stage—to the ghastly assumption that only bad faith was ever known in the relationship of nations. The wholesome earlier situation must be brought back.

A third thing for which we are fighting—as Greece knows well, and Poland, the Norwegians and the Czechs and the Hollanders and many more nationals of a small state—is to make life again safe for a small people. To make it unsafe, intolerable for a small people except by surrendering independence and cultivating a terrified submissiveness to a powerful neighbour—this is the avowed dictatorial purpose. We are fighting to end that—fighting

to make the small country among large countries as secure as the poor man with little means of self-protection among the rich and powerful. In a civilized state—I mean those not yet within the range of the Axis—there is such equal security. It is not surprising, it is indeed altogether natural, that in countries where individual life is held so cheap as in Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy, there should be a like contempt for the plainest axioms of justice among nations. However far that corruption has gone, we must restore the ways of a healthier time. We are fighting this war for the rights of a small people. Success of the great state in competition with the small is natural. Outrage by the great upon the small is, for civilization, intolerable. A thing this war is being fought to finish is the monstrous presumption of the super-state.

These are the causes at stake—as the whole honest world now knows, and as neither a Virginio Gayda nor a Paul Joseph Goebbels can disprove, though from time to time each of them may make some headway, among minds easily confused, with a new brand of falsehood. That is why we cannot too carefully insist on restatement of war aims.

Gentlemen, though this fight is not for Britain alone but for all freedom-loving mankind, do we not realize with proud emotion how nearly coincident these causes have been?

They have coincided many times before:

Not once or twice in our rough island-story
The path of duty was the way to glory.

In 1914, when Germany tried to bargain with Britain and would have bid high for a free hand against Russia and France, even as she tried to bargain two years ago for a free hand against Poland, she encountered the same disdainful refusal. Neville Chamberlain's reply to Hitler was like Sir Edward Grey's to von Jagow. Poles now, like Belgians a quarter of a century ago, for the time overwhelmed, have their hope fixed upon the British champion. Go back a hundred years further, to the days of Britain's

leadership against Napoleon, in defence of the freedom which Power after Power had given up, but for which Pitt—like Mr. Churchill—though many European coalitions should collapse, would continue to lead his country, if need be, alone. Turn back the pages of history to a point a hundred years earlier still: note what country was first in the fight, carried the heaviest burden, faced the gravest risk, won the chief glory of rescuing Europe from Louis XIV. The Prime Minister at least must thrill at the remembrance not only of Europe organized for that fight by Britain, but of Britain's fighting strength then organized and led by General John Churchill. (Applause.)

This lone championship, illustrating again a great tradition, now fascinates more and more the imagination of the world. It has already proved, it bids fair to continue to prove harder than any in the series which preceded it. At the end of the first eighteen months, as we survey gain and loss, there is much to be reckoned on both sides of the account. One of the enemy partners has indeed been overwhelmed, but Britain's own great partner, on whom she depended for so much, has—at least officially—given up the fight. Thanks to the skill of the Royal Air Force, by which so much had to be improvised, and to the fortitude of the British people, which has never need for improvisation, the boastful threats about invading the Island have been made to share the general ignominy of Nazi forecasts. In the opposite column of the reckoning have to be placed the losses, necessarily great, to the merchant shipping on which the Island must rely, and for which the American aid so eagerly and already so lavishly supplied will require time to show its full strength. But, Gentlemen, it is part of the great tradition to which I have alluded that difficulty and hardship and danger do not weaken, they rather stiffen and intensify the British will to triumph. The British people at such a time are like those Puritan soldiers in the great English historian's description—though outnumbered by foes and abandoned by allies, never so sedate and stubborn as towards the close of a doubtful and murderous day.

We are determined to win because what is at stake is what we dare under no circumstances lose. It is that for which down the centuries the British people have never judged any risk too great to take, and their acceptance of gigantic risk now once again has not only rallied to their aid the most powerful of all auxiliaries, but is also visibly reanimating and re-nerving for battle not a few who had despaired. The oppressed of three continents, not only the crushed vassal States on Europe's western seaboard, but those who speak for suffering millions in China, for native races which have writhed under the German or the Italian lash in Africa from Tripoli to the Cape—they at least have no doubt of the contrast between Nazi or Fascist and British rule abroad. They do not share the hesitant mood which so often haunts one of our own "intellectuals," always more concerned for the open mind than for the resolute purpose, and extending benefit of the doubt to every country but his own. Not being profound historians or subtle political scientists, the African tribal leaders have no difficulty about "ideological contrast." They are not sophisticated enough to find any puzzle about whether "after all" there is anything to choose between different sorts of European imperialism. Their simple minds, dependent only on their own experience, are clear on that point. From the Moslem tribesmen in Libya, from what was once German West Africa and German East Africa, from Bechuanaland and Somaliland, not less than from Poland or Czechoslovakia comes the unambiguous witness that with British victory the hopes of justice for all mankind, especially the weakest, are bound up. From Washington, especially in the strains of America's incomparable leader at the White House, comes the inspiring message—Since yours is the guardianship of what we not less than you hold precious, you shall not lose if, with the help of all we have to give, you can win.

Such issues being at stake, and such being the world's growing response, there can be no ultimate prospect for Britain but triumph. (Applause.)

MR. E. F. THOMPSON: Mr. Hector Charlesworth has kindly consented to express our thanks to Dr. Stewart.

MR. HECTOR CHARLESWORTH: Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen of the Empire Club: You have for the last half hour come to a realization of the lucid and well-informed mind of Dr. Stewart and of his strong past-mastery of our mother tongue. (Applause.)

I have a special personal pride in Dr. Stewart because I in 1933, when we were organizing broadcasting in Canada, was privileged and honoured to make him a household word in this country. We found him broadcasting in the city of Halifax, that fine city of which he is the leading intellectual luminary, broadcasting in the Halifax Herald station; those broadcasts then were so fine that we decided that he should go among the pioneers of the Canadian National network. It was my boast during the three and a half years when I had contacts with Dr. Stewart in my capacity as Chairman, that in Canada—and I made this boast in New York at radio conferences and elsewhere—that in Canada in our national network we had the finest news commentator on the continent of North America. (Applause.) Dr. Stewart is not heard weekly now, which I greatly regret, but on every occasion on which he is on the air, I think I have listened to him, and though the numbers of news commentators have increased almost one hundredfold since those days, I still hold that opinion.

Dr. Stewart, it is with the utmost pleasure I convey the thanks of this assemblage and of the thousands of listeners of the unseen audience who I know share my opinion. Thank you very much, Sir. (Applause.)

MR. E. F. THOMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Charlesworth and Dr. Stewart.

"THE SIGNIFICANCE OF SOUTH AMERICA TO CANADA"

AN ADDRESS BY

DR. JOHN R. MOTT

Chairman : The First Vice-President, Mr. C. R. Sanderson

March 20, 1941

MR. C. R. SANDERSON: Gentlemen: The speaker at the Empire Club of Canada to-day is Dr. John R. Mott, who is known all over the world. He is an outstanding missionary statesman and a great religious leader whose whole career has been given over to movements of world-wide concern. I could go through a long list of his present and past offices, but may I just particularize by saying he was the founder of the World Student Christian Federation; he was the Chief Executive of the Foreign Division of the Young Men's Christian Association; he is President of the World Alliance of the Young Men's Christian Association; he is Vice-President of the World's Council of Churches; and he is Chairman of the International Missionary Council. In recognition of his work and his achievements he has been honoured by universities on both sides of the Atlantic and he has received decorations from twelve different countries. Despite all his other activities he has had time to write over a dozen books, and together with all this he has made a special study of South America. To-day he comes to talk to us on "The Significance of South America to Canada."

Gentlemen, I present to you Dr. John R. Mott. (Applause.)

DR. JOHN R. MOTT: Mr. Chairman and Friends: I value highly the privilege of meeting in this somewhat intimate way with a company that I recognize as men of really wide outlook and of true responsiveness to the serious purposes that are moving across the world right now. As the Chairman has indicated, my life has been a life of service, of organizations and movements that are literally world-wide, and this has not been accomplished by remaining at a headquarters or in an office chair, but has necessitated my moving ceaselessly among the nations.

These journeys have taken me over the world many times. I was asked the other day in one of the countries of South America how many countries I had visited. I had to give it up, but that was an industrious reporter and he kept at me until he had proved, in a way that I couldn't go back on, that I had been to seventy-eight or seventy-nine different countries; and what fascinated him more was that I had been in most of them again and again.

Now, I grant you there is a certain advantage in moving over the world at intervals. It enables one to study the contrasts that are constantly in evidence and the currents of thought and feeling that are ever surging, literally across the world. It is a most fascinating experience, but more important, it gives you the chance of studying at first hand the workings of the law of progress and I must add, the working of the law of retrogression.

Now, this is background. I am asked if I would not specialize in any comments I might make to-day upon Latin America. This I gladly do.

My first visits to Latin America were about thirty-five years ago, and my latest visit to Latin America was during the last year, when I made four separate trips to as many parts of Latin America. In January, to Mexico; in March, to Porto Rico and the neighbouring islands of the Caribbean; in April, to Cuba; and from May to July inclusive, the countries of eastern South America, that great area of Argentine, Uruguay and Brazil. And I start down next week to cover the countries of the northern belt of South America and the west coast, and on my

way back, that interesting little cluster of Central American States.

Now, you are anxious, I am sure, that I should plunge in at once and give you the outstanding impressions that I think we ought to keep vividly in our consciousness here in Canada at the present time.

One is the expansion in the population. In the period between my visits the population has just about doubled in some countries and in others it has more than doubled. Look for a moment at cities. When I first went down to Argentine, Buenos Aires had six hundred thousand people. It now has three million. Montevideo had less than three hundred thousand and it now has six hundred thousand. Sao Paulo had two hundred thousand and it now has one million, two hundred and fifty thousand; Rio had, I recall, six hundred thousand and it is now nearly if not quite two million.

There is nothing comparable to this, except in the case of Tokyo following the earthquake, and possibly the city of Los Angeles. And the texture of the population of South America has markedly changed in the years covered. There is woven into the population something like two to three million Germans, and an Italian element to the number of over five million. When I was there the first time there were probably only half a dozen Japanese and they were attached to the Embassies. Now I found in Brazil alone, about two hundred thousand Japanese.

Thus I could go on and speak of other elements woven into the population. Now, it may interest you to have me point out that, if you add to Latin America the French Canadians—and why shouldn't we?—and add possibly seven million Italians of the United States of America—and why shouldn't we?—we would find the Latin population of the Western Hemisphere is almost the same as that which we call the Anglo-Saxon population, plus certain elements like the Scandinavians. People don't generally realize that. They simply think of this as an Anglo-Saxon hemisphere or as a Latin hemisphere. It is becom-

ing increasingly a cosmopolitan hemisphere. Moreover it is still in the foundation-laying period, the most plastic of all the continents of the world, and this has a very real meaning to us all.

Another impression that I bring is of the unprecedented material development. I think parts of Latin America have witnessed greater expansion than almost any other part of the world, but more important than that, I would emphasize the material possibilities of Latin America, the undeveloped possibilities. They are of concern to us in Canada.

Now, take Brazil as an illustration. That is a country as large as the United States of America, plus an area larger than Texas. It is a country that is surrounded by eight other countries. We speak with great pride and deep satisfaction of the United States and Canada having a border of three thousand miles and no fortifications. Brazil has no fortifications between her and her eight neighbours. I have never visited a country in my travels with larger material possibilities. The only countries I can bracket with Brazil in respect to undeveloped possibilities, are the Dominion of Canada, the Siberian stretches of Russia and the Belgian Congo.

Consider, under the ground in Brazil, the resources in diamonds, gold and iron alone give it distinction. Or take right on the surface. When I was down in North Carolina the other day they told me that they have about one hundred and twenty varieties of trees, largely hardwood. In the Amazonian belt they tell me they have eleven hundred varieties of trees, largely hardwood. There is a wealth of timber in range of variety and quality, the like of which the world does not have elsewhere, excepting perhaps the Congo basin of Africa.

Or, you could supply the whole demand of the world for coffee in Brazil. She could take care of the whole demand of the world for sugar and could almost do the same for cotton. She could do the same for fruit, and the list runs on. They have 15 per cent of the water-power

of the world in Brazil. By the way, that Amazon Basin is the most impressive physical phenomenon in the world, I sometimes think. There is the great Amazon Basin and the river itself, with a width of one hundred and eighty miles at the outflow, and you have to travel up the river twenty-eight hundred miles in order to reach a width the size of the Mississippi at the outlet in the Gulf of Mexico, and then you go eight hundred miles or more up into Peru, and before you reach the end of the great river you have gone over four thousand miles, with great rivers running out in each direction. I have seen nothing like it, only when I took a flying trip over the Belgian Congo, not long since, and looked down on the network of rivers there.

I was told by economists that Brazil could maintain nine hundred million people and then not be cultivated as intensively as Denmark or Holland.

So here are unlimited material possibilities and I have only referred to Brazil. If I took you to Argentine I could tell you similar things. For example, they told me they shipped five thousand tons of meat each week to Great Britain, and I notice the convoys are helping to keep up the pace. I will not trouble you with a whole mass of statistics about the live stock and other resources of Argentine, or what might be more impressive, pick out some of the little countries that we hear so little about, and tell you of their resources.

Now, this reminds me of another impression—of the great financial stake we have down there. Great Britain now has invested, quite securely, about \$4,000,000,000, chiefly in railways, and they have got a splendid record, as some of my friends here know.

The United States of North America has in all Latin America—not simply South America where British investments are chiefly—we have in all Latin America somewhat over \$4,000,000,000. I am not talking of a lot of wildcat ventures or projects, but solid, reliable investments.

I made enquiry of friends here the other day about Canada. I couldn't get the statistics I wanted, but probably one of your best authorities passed on the word to me that you have down there not less than \$600,000,000 invested, largely, I believe, in Brazil, but partly over the Andes on the west side.

Let me say this in passing. On my first visit down there the Sao Paulo Light and Power Company—I don't know exactly what they used to call it—impressed me as the finest foreign corporation with which I had come into contact, and I found last year that it has continued true to its earlier record. I mention this among Canadians, that spanning a whole generation you have been able to do a piece of work that commands the confidence and the friendly feeling of the Latin Americans, and that says a great deal.

We of the Mother Country, Canada and the United States in particular, have got to get our heads together and talk over these economic questions as they concern our relations with Latin America. Britain and the United States got in on the wrong foot in some respects. The Latin Americans speak of the United States as "the Colossus of the North." They are afraid of us. That is where Canada is going to have the great advantage. With reference to England, they don't like the way she regards them—almost as if she were an absentee landlord and not interested in developing Latin initiative and collaboration.

I am only touching, incidentally, something that should be the subject of profound consultation and participation, particularly among us English-speaking countries.

But, my friends, don't let me leave this point without putting myself on record by saying I think Canada has the opportunity of the ages—materially, commercially, financially, in the Latin American Republics, from Mexico and the Islands, right down to Argentine and Chile. This I honestly believe.

Now, a word about the cultural development of the Latin countries. In some ways that puts us to shame.

Take the press of Latin America. I don't know of any country in the world that has papers quite like *La Prensa* and *La Nación*, in Buenos Aires, and *Jornal do Commercio* of Rio. I was told that these three papers devote, on the average, some thirty-five columns a day to international affairs. Now, the *New York Times* which, I suppose, is the paper that does the most in this respect in North America, does not average twenty-five columns. I found the Latin American press much more fully in touch with all that is going on overseas, looking eastward, than we are. When I speak of those three papers, I could pick out other examples in other parts of Latin America.

We are away ahead with reference to the Orient—news about Japan and China and India, and so on. I came to take off my hat to the press down there. Of course they have some sheets of which they ought to be ashamed, and surely we have, but generally speaking, they deserve distinction.

Then when I think of the outflow of books and brochures, not only their own, for which they have won a reputation, but their awareness of the best material that is coming out, not only in Spain, Portugal, Germany and Italy, but in Great Britain, in Holland, in the Scandinavian countries, and in the new countries like Czechoslovakia, and to some extent the Oriental countries, like India.

My wife says this is my most dangerous hobby—the frequenting of the book-shops. I go a good deal. I have good interpreters; I don't trust my own knowledge. I was amazed and humbled by the wealth of their book-stores in foreign works, in contrast with what we have in Canada and the United States and in some of the European countries. They are sitting literally at the feet of the scholastic world, as set forth in our literature in certain departments.

We brought down there from the United States an exhibit of twenty-six hundred books, brought out in the United States of America. This has awakened wide interest and appreciation.

Then I think of the universities and the school system. That is very spotty. In some parts it is worthy of our study, but, generally speaking, I think we must in honesty, without boasting, say that our two great English-speaking countries lead in the educational world. They have some brilliant universities. The two oldest universities in this hemisphere are in Latin America—the one in Lima, the other in Mexico City; they antedate Harvard and the oldest colleges in Canada. Some of those universities have a unique record in the leadership they furnish, not simply for their respective countries, but in international affairs.

The little country, Uruguay, has the distinguished honour of conceiving the idea of the League of Nations, even before Woodrow Wilson, and anybody here who has been in touch with the League of Nations knows what a contribution came from these Latin countries as a whole, including some of the smallest ones.

So, I would praise, with restraint, but with great heartiness, the intellectual product of Latin America; and I repeat, some of the universities, some of the middle schools, some of the lower schools, are good, but generally speaking, however, they can well look to us.

Speaking still of the cultural development, I am reminded of the so-called learned societies there. We might bow before them in many cases. We have been so absorbed with the money-making process that we have probably not given as much attention as we might to the fostering of scientific, literary and other cultural societies. I think also of clubs. We are doing fairly well in clubs here in North America, but every traveller in Latin America will agree with me, that they have the most expensive equipment. I mean, the largest buildings, the best adapted buildings, costing enormously more than anything we have here on either side of the line or in the British Isles. Not only are large sums of money invested, but there is a great membership—ten thousand, fifteen thousand, twenty thousand—and they have great programmes in physical culture, social progress and along

countless other lines. They have much for us to study and heed.

Then I would emphasize their interest in social uplift. I am not so sure but that they manifest greater social consciousness than we do, generally speaking. I don't know of a country up here that I would bracket with that little country of Uruguay, a country of two million people. If you have never read the book called, *Utopia in Uruguay*, just get it and it will make you ashamed of our social legislation in America and in the Canadian provinces. And, by the way, Mexico, that we look on with suspicion and anxiety, and, at times with some reason, for our solicitude, I would say that Mexico has some things to teach us in North America and in the British Isles. I say it with some humiliation, but it was just burned into me down there on my last visit. I must in honesty admit they are up in front. They are in an almost impossible position. I don't blame them for wanting possession of what is below the ground. I don't blame them for wanting to have the great estates broken up so that the poor man may have his chance. I don't blame them for wanting enough food to provide for more than one meal a day. I say they have a conscience and a purpose and they are putting some of us in a position which I hope will quicken our consciences.

Now, I want to pass on as you would expect me to do, to say a word about their attitude in this war. Here again, my judgment is that of one person, although a world traveller who has no axes to grind and I trust no wrong motive. I myself estimate that nine-tenths of the intelligentsia of Latin America and other influential classes think with the Allies and are against the aggressive powers. I estimate nine-tenths. Some will take issue. This varies; there are parts of Brazil where we wouldn't say 90 per cent, but taking Latin America as a whole—and I speak with intimate knowledge for I had countless interviews with people who were in the know and had chapter and verse, and have poured over all the material. I thus record this, and I would go further and say that

is all the more remarkable, in view of these things, that this war has caused all Latin America to suffer economically, in a way that we are not suffering in Canada or in the United States. I think you all know it has taken two-thirds of their markets right off.

They have been put under a supreme test, with the German propaganda which is very effective. I heard it and saw it among them when I was there last summer, saying, "Order from us. By October we will be here to defend you." The calculations have been missing, but they have a great purchase on us in having given them a good market—over two-thirds of their market. I say it is all the more remarkable in view of these things, that I can say with sincerity that probably nine-tenths of the people most in the know, and here I include the men in industry, commerce and finance, as well as the intelligentsia proper, have their sympathies, not with the aggressor. If there is anybody who doubts this, I am prepared to be cross-questioned. (Applause.)

Now, you say, what do they think about the United States of America? Well they were glad that we were increasingly lining up with the Mother Country and with Canada. They were glad of that but they were beginning to be very skeptical. They were reading our Congressional debates, they were reading that it would take nearly five years, at least four years, to develop another navy, so we would have a navy for each ocean. They said to me, "No, Mr. Mott, if it is going to take America that long to get ready, aren't we in danger if we should line up on this side? Aren't we in danger of being left on a limb the way Czechoslovakia, the way Poland, the way Holland was?"

Thank God, my friends, the events of the last month, summarized in the purpose expressed by our President Roosevelt, will have disabused their minds of that.

I won't discuss here the seriousness of the situation down there. It is a matter of profound concern to us here. The so-called fifth column business is, I would say,

at its best and at its worst. By at its best, I mean that I know of no part of the world where it is so ably led, intellectually, where the plans are so comprehensive or call forth more of your admiration—if you forget your conscience. I don't know of a place where there has been so much money put in it or so much sacrificial devotion—and I use that word sacrificial, advisedly. It isn't in spots, it covers all Latin America, as with a web, with central direction. Now, there are many exaggerated things said in our press but I don't think we can well overstate the seriousness of it.

My friends here know that I am in no sense a pacifist. I think, I hope, I am a realist. I prefer to take no chances on the thing I am talking about now. We had better err on the other side. Here is one of my strongest convictions—that right here in this Western Hemisphere we have got twenty Latin American Republics, we have got the United States of America and we have got the Dominion of Canada. Now, notice, follow me closely. Here we have got twenty-two nations, the largest contiguous bloc of countries to be found anywhere on earth—not in Africa, not in Asia, not in Europe—I say it is the largest contiguous bloc. And notice, what is more important, possessing common political traditions, common political ideals, and more than I used to think, common political institutions, in the sense of democratic institutions.

Now, it is my belief that if these twenty-two countries not only see eye to eye—in my judgment we do, measurably—but, more important, if we should give the world the unmistakable impression that we do see eye to eye, then we on this hemisphere could become the greatest stabilizing force, the most magnetic unifying core around which will gather others, emphatically the whole British Commonwealth of Nations, and the list will run on.

I hope I make my meaning clear. There is an advantage in contiguity—chronological and geographical. There is an advantage in having a core that is not in the full maelstrom. The bombs are not falling on us here. Thank

God, we are identified with the suffering over there, and it is my belief that my country will be there too before long. We are here between the oceans, and by the way, that brings me to pause, and say the Havana Meeting didn't meet a day too soon.

I said to the *New York Times* the day I landed at New York from South America last July, that if the Havana Meeting doesn't adopt a single resolution or make a single decision, it is infinitely worth all it is going to cost. My idea was that it would create an atmosphere. The atmosphere was surcharged with suspicion and forebodings and Havana cleared the air like a great thunder storm. Thank God, that made possible what some people didn't believe was possible. We went there and adopted some of the most statesmanlike measures ever adopted in international affairs, in which Great Britain and the United States of America, including Canada, committed themselves, and performed a great act of trust in saying we are going to have some common bases for air and navy, up and down this coast. That was only an entering wedge and, by the way, that went further than the prophets predicted. It was only an entering wedge of the things that will follow.

Therefore, my friends, you don't wonder that I come among you, heavily burdened with the conviction that we must busy ourselves in weaving together these twenty-two countries that God has so blessed on this Western Hemisphere, these plastic countries, these countries that are not ashamed to make changes, that are not ashamed to take the initiative, that are not ashamed to stake their all on their initiative. There is everything to gain by our seeing eye to eye and moving together. There is nothing, as far as I can see, to be lost by it.

Now, you ask this question, you say: Before you sit down share with us some of your deepest constructive suggestions as to how we shall be woven more closely together.

First, I would say we should bring it about so that

Canada hereafter becomes an official part of all the Pan-American Conferences. Why not? I ask myself, why not? And I cannot think of one reason. Now, we have had eight of these great Conferences. The first was in Washington in 1889, the last in Lima in 1938. I am well acquainted with all the gatherings. I attended one of the most notable in the Munroe Palace in Rio in 1906. They have an honourable record. I can think of no reason for Canada not being integrated with every such gathering.

Secondly, I want to see Canada become a part in what we call the Pan-American Union. This is something quite different. It is a permanent organization in which all the American Republics and the United States of America have definite seats. Mr. Carnegie, with splendid international vision, just as he gave the Peace Hall in Holland at The Hague, gave the splendid home in Washington that some of you have visited. If any of you have not visited it I wish you would the next time you go to Washington. There is a network of activity, basic to what we are talking about here to-day. The best research work being done in any of the countries is being done there under the International Committee in which the Latins have twenty votes and the United States of America has one. Why shouldn't Canada be there? Again, I say I see no reason. We want you to be a party to the investigations, and not only the investigations, but to do a score of things that you expect a body called the Pan-American Union to do.

Now, thirdly, I am eager to see some of your great statesmen of Canada follow the lead, all too tardily taken in the United States of America. Two of our Presidents have gone down there. Hoover did, and it was one of the best things he did after he was elected. He went to Latin America the first thing. I never knew him to miss a point in the programme that I am talking about here and I trace that largely to the fact that he went down there.

Our present President has been down there and in his busy life it wasn't easy to go. He also sent Mr. Hull, Secretary of State, who to a unique degree has the confidence and the affection of the Latin American people.

They took me up to the House of Congress in Montevideo and were proud to point to the seat where Mr. Hull sat. He won their hearts. He took hold of their imagination.

I remember also one of the three greatest international minds the United States has ever produced—Senator Root—I sat at his feet—President Wilson sent him out on a Commission to Russia, and I crossed the Pacific both ways and travelled through the great wilds of Siberia with him. He went down to South America. If you have never seen his speeches, and probably they are only to be found in the Congressional or Parliamentary Library, get the speeches that he gave in capitals on the east coast and the west coast as models of what I call statesmanship in international matters and commercial matters. His address in Kansas City or St. Louis, on his return, to the men of industry, commerce and finance, is a classic in its interpretation of what our men of industry, commerce and finance should be doing with Latin America.

My next word would be that we interest ourselves, just as the State Departments have done recently by calling on young Nelson Rockefeller to co-ordinate the economic and the cultural. Some people say that can't be done. The other day I congratulated Mr. Hull and young Rockefeller on attempting what others call the impossible. If we can co-ordinate our economic contacts in Latin America, with the cultural, we will do something that ought to have been done long ago.

Now, my next word may strike you as presumptuous and awkward from me, as an American. Don't forget I have had my summer home in Canada for forty years. Two of my children are married to Canadians, and I have got some grandchildren—don't forget this.

I will tell you what I was going to lead up to with reference to your contacts over there. That is, we should make much more of these fraternal things—the intimate contacts. Coming back on my boat there was a whole company of American women representing the women's clubs of all the leading cities in the United States. They had

been over all of Latin America. One woman was eighty years old. By the way, I don't know any part of the world where women have a more powerful voice than in South America, so the women's clubs in going down there made a splendid move. Why shouldn't the Canadian women line up and make such a visitation?

That leads me to another point. Professor Stephen Duggan, of Columbia University, conceived the idea of a great interchange of students between Latin America and the United States. As a result there have been thousands of Latin American students up in the American universities, and now a smaller number of United States students is beginning to go down that way. The other day one hundred and forty students from different universities of Latin America came up here and located themselves at the University of North Carolina to study English and American institutions. Before that we had sent something like sixty to Lima, Peru, and there they held institutes and retreats under the guidance of Latin Americans.

Now, the United States made this notable resolution which was adopted at the Lima and Pan-American Conference. Look at this: That every American State, that is every one of the twenty Latin American Republics and the United States—and I now ask: Why not Canada?—that every American State should send one professor and two students each year to every other American State. That would mean that Canada would pick out twenty-one professors and twice as many students and send them to each of the twenty-one countries, including the United States, for one year. They would do the same with you.

Now, that has been adopted by. I think nine countries already. Others will adopt it. It is a drop in the bucket but it is very important when you think of the strategic value. You see the intelligentsia—that is the word they use down there—the intelligentsia of Latin America is a great reality. If we want to carry Latin America with us we have got to carry the thinking, leading minds of those brilliant Republics, and this is one good way to go about it.

I have said to my friend here, President Cody, and also to my friend, Bishop White, that nothing could be more helpful than that you might some day have in this city an International House. My older son, who was, by the way, a soldier in the last war and went to serve in India for several years, has served and is now serving in such International Houses for students. First, at Cornell University, then he was at the head of one in New York, made possible by Rockefeller, where they have five hundred students from sixty nations. First, are the Canadians, next the Chinese, and thirdly, the Latin Americans, and the list runs on down to sixty countries.

Now, I have been pleased to find that the Chinese have found a place here at the University of Toronto. That is splendid. I see great things for the future. But I asked the President of the University of Toronto, why not have scores of Latin American students coming up here? They will be less afraid of you than they are of the United States of America. I repeat that they call us "The Colossus of the North." They are afraid of our money power. They are not yet afraid of you. You can mediate, you can help us in the United States, you can introduce us a little better.

Let me mention another thing we want to be doing. That is to support right away the work of our churches—Protestant and Roman Catholic. I am going to another lecture this afternoon and I will amplify this point, but I will ask your permission to pass by this merely saying that I have discovered, largely because of religious views, that we must implement man's industry, commerce, finance, education and culture with a power infinitely more than human. What we need is superhuman wisdom and love and power manifested. Now, I enter the plea that you put yourselves behind these great forces.

Now, my last word is this. It may strike you as strange but I would rather you would forget many things I have said and let this have full weight. That is, let us of Canada and the United States study how we can identify ourselves more with the feeling—I am using that

word advisedly—more with the feeling of the Latin American people. They are swayed more by feeling than by argument or by force. They are open-hearted, demonstrative, out-going. They have a word in Spanish—"sympatico"—that means more than our word "sympathy," it means sympathy with deep understanding and full response. If they say a man is "sympatico," they cannot pay a higher tribute than that. In business it opens every door. In the religious realm they look on him as a prophet from heaven. That is one thing of which we cold Anglo-Saxons can't have too much.

Also, they are very courteous, very polite. It is almost a mortal sin to violate some of the laws of that kind, but I couple with it the thought that they are kindly, considerate. Though they may be very punctilious themselves, they are so kindly they overlook our awful breaks, and that is a trait we might well envy them.

Again I think of a trait that we have not got that is exceedingly important there—that is their leisureliness. They are the opposite of what we call strenuous. Time doesn't mean much to them. The watch and the clock and the bell might just as well be eliminated. With them, to-morrow is the day of decision; with us, it is to-day. And with my busy programme lined up, I found I had to adjust myself to to-morrow. I have to do a lot of things to-morrow that I wanted to do to-day. When I did that I began to find doors open and they began to think I was a little "sympatico."

Another great trait they have got is that they love beauty and all the finer graces. This applies to both the men and the women. There is no part of the world where you would be more impressed by that, and again, I say it is not without its advantage that we have exposure to them.

Then they are intensely national, and of course I hope we all are, but I don't know of such intense manifestations of extreme nationalism—not in the totalitarian form—God forbid—but in love of country, as shown by every test.

Again, coupled with that, they are very internationally minded. I spoke of the little country, Uruguay. I spoke of what I saw at the League of Nations. Mr. Rowell will bear testimony to this. He can bear testimony to the little Latin American countries. It is the little countries to which we are most indebted. I mean the little countries like Belgium, Denmark, Norway, Holland, Greece, the little Balkan States and some of the little Latin American Republics. You see the world was afraid of itself in the bigger dimensions and in the League the little countries have their inning. That is one reason I believe so strongly in the League and believe that we will have to come back to it at all costs.

One more trait, and I stake the whole argument on this. It is the mystical note in the Latin American character. I didn't think this would be the case. I found the mystical element. The book that helped me most—my wife and I read it all the way down there—is *The Invisible Christ*, written by a man called Ricardo Rojas, who was born a Roman Catholic. He is more of a rationalist now. He has written one of the most helpful books on Jesus Christ that I have read, not excepting *The Imitation*, because it is written for this time. It is written by a native of Argentine, with an introduction by my friend, Robert E. Speer, who wouldn't be translating that book, as we men here who know him deeply realize, if it were not all that I say.

So with all the things I say about the material crust of the civilization of Latin America, carry away in your memories, friends, these last hints that I have given you of the traits of the Latin people. Ask yourselves, wouldn't it be helpful to us if we could have larger exposure to them and that they might have larger exposure to us? God grant that all of us may live long enough to see our vision fulfilled. (Applause—prolonged.)

MR. C. R. SANDERSON: Gentlemen, Dr. Mott has not only given us that illuminating and penetrating analysis

of South America which we knew he would give us, he has really given us a synthesis of the whole American Hemisphere. And as I see it, it is not only the knowledge which he has brought to us to-day, it is the special emphasis he has so strongly and directly placed on the importance of our thinking internationally, that makes this address so wonderful. We talk about the increasing significance of Canada in world affairs. It is true, we can see Canada becoming more important, month by month, internationally. But what Dr. Mott has driven home to-day is the importance of our educating ourselves for the position which Canada is going to occupy in world affairs when this war is over.

Sir, I need not express our appreciation. The unfailing attention which every member of the audience has given to you must have told you how much your address has been appreciated. But, Sir, I do offer you an expression of our gratitude for a great address which we shall read again with the same intense interest that we have listened to it. (Applause.)

“ANGLO-AMERICAN RESPONSIBILITIES”

AN ADDRESS BY

MR. MAX W. BALL, F.G.S.A.

Chairman: Mr. E. F. Thompson

Thursday, March 27, 1941

MR. E. F. THOMPSON: Gentlemen, may I have your attention for a minute or two? To-day, in accordance with our Constitution, it is our custom to select a Nominating Committee for the season 1941-42.

MR. J. D. SPENCE, K.C.: Mr. Chairman, in accordance with the Constitution of the Club, I beg to propose the following to be members of the Nominating Committee for the selection of Officers and Executive Committee of the Club for the year 1941-42,—the election of such to take place at the Annual Meeting of the Club:

Messrs. C. R. Sanderson
J. P. Pratt, K.C.
W. Eason Humphreys
R. A. Stapells
Tracy Lloyd
C. R. Conquergood
Hector Charlesworth
Sigmund Samuel, LL.D.
Dr. F. A. Gaby (Chairman)

MR. A. W. MILES: Gentlemen, I take pleasure in seconding the motion. CARRIED.

MR. E. F. THOMPSON: Members of the Empire Club, Guests, and our Unseen Audience of the Air: We

are fortunate in having as our speaker to-day an authority on oil, and a writer of some note. He has contributed from time to time numerous books and articles on technical and economic subjects. During the past year he has published a book which has been widely read, entitled "This Fascinating Oil Business." Fascinating also, to say the least, is the biographical sketch of our guest, which in activity in his chosen field, the development of oil, is very complete. I am sorry that there is not time to give you the whole picture, but I would like particularly to mention that since graduation from University, where he attained the degrees of E.M., LL.B., and LL.M., he has been closely allied with the oil industry. Among the many important posts that he has filled was that of Chairman of the Oil Board of the United States Geological Survey. He has been President of companies affiliated with the Standard Oil Company of Indiana, and now heads Abasand Oil Limited, of Edmonton, Alberta.

Those of you who drive motor cars well know that you cannot rely on one grade of oil but must vary the grade throughout the year to get the best performance from your automobile engine. This, I feel, also applies to the human machine, as in the case of our guest who, instead of coming from only one stock, has a varied ancestry, consisting of English, Scottish, Irish, Dutch and Swiss. You will be interested to know that the ancestors referred to came to this continent between the years 1620 and 1820.

It is a great privilege to have the pleasure of introducing to you Mr. Max W. Ball, who was born in Illinois, raised on Pike's Peak, and is now the proud possessor of the title, *Fellow of the Geological Society of America*. I give you Mr. Max W. Ball, who will address you on the subject *Anglo-American Responsibilities*. (Applause.)

MR. MAX W. BALL: Gentlemen,: If there is any disappointment as to the subject of my talk to-day, and as to what I say, don't charge it to me, nor to your Hon-

orary Secretary, charge it to the telegraph company. For once the telegraph company transmitted more than they were paid for and put an extra "f" in a telegram. I wired your Secretary, at his request, that I should be glad to speak on "Anglo-American Responsibilities" or "Germany's Oil Supply." The telegraph company donated "f" and made it read "Anglo-American Responsibilities for Germany's Oil Supply." They happen to be two different talks. I wish we were all twins so that I could give and you could listen to both of them at once. As it is, I have left the selection to your officers and they have asked me to speak on "Anglo-American Responsibilities," so, except for a very brief reference, oil will be left out.

The subject upon which I do want to talk to you involves a review of a generation of Anglo-American relationships and a consideration of the joint responsibility of the English-thinking peoples in the years to come after the war. I am assuming that sooner or later we shall win this war. Both history and economics point to the same conclusion, that Germany has attempted the impossible and that the seeds of defeat are already sown.

If I were giving the other talk, which I am not, I would analyze for you one economic factor, the factor of Germany's oil supply, and because I am not giving it, I will summarize it this far. (Applause.) Giving Germany the benefit of every doubt as to other sources of supply, giving her the benefit of every doubt as to the amount of synthetic substitutes which she can make, giving her the benefit of every doubt as to the extent to which she can restrict civilian consumption within her own borders and within the countries that she has overrun, I can come to no conclusion except that Germany to-day, Germany and her associates, are running behind to the extent of at least four million barrels a month, over and above her available supplies, including such imports as she has been getting from Russia, and including of course the entire Rumanian production, and making no deductions for what the R.A.F. has been doing, which has been plenty, to her oil plants and refineries.

That deficit of at least four million barrels a month must, of course, come out of storage, and although there are many conjectural factors in the amount of storage that Germany may have, it seems impossible that she can have much more than 21 million barrels. From there on you can figure out the answer for yourselves. That is only one economic factor.

Aside from such tangible factors, moreover, I am convinced that the spirit of freedom is unquenchable, and that no combination of powers will be able to rout it from the British Commonwealth of Nations and the United States. Stronger even than this conviction is my faith in a God who will not suffer the defeat of man's aspiration to be master of his own soul. I am sure that all of you share that faith, and that we need not argue it. We can start with the assumption that the war will end in victory.

The subject we are to consider, then, is the relationship of the English-thinking peoples during the conflict, and their joint responsibilities in the difficult days that will follow it.

No talk on such a subject is worth listening to unless the audience knows the background and fundamental beliefs of the speaker. No human statement stands alone; behind and beside and within it are the ideals and the bias of the man who makes it. Because I am a stranger to most of you, I am constrained to talk about myself before I talk about more important matters. The review may be profitable, not because of the subject, but because it may illustrate the evolution of an attitude toward England.

I am an American citizen, born in the United States. All of my ancestors for from five to nine generations back were born in the United States. The most recent migrant to America came from Switzerland when Indian raids were still common in western Pennsylvania. The others were English, Scotch, Irish and Dutch. I have never been outside North America, and never more than a mile south of the Rio Grande.

Since 1930 I have spent much of my time in Canada, and since early in 1937 I have lived in Edmonton. For

several years my principal business interest has been in Canada. I have been welcomed and made to feel that I am wanted, and I feel as much at home on this side of the line as on the other. I am not a full-time Canadian, however; I maintain an office in Denver and my consulting work takes me hither and yon throughout the United States. My son is attending the Colorado School of Mines and says "skedule" and "zee"; my daughter is attending the University of Alberta and says "shedule" and "zed." I am probably as complete a Canadian-American hybrid as can be found.

What, then, about my attitude toward things British? Like most Americans of my years, I was taught in school to think of the British as tyrants, the enemy who tried to keep the American colonies in subjection and against whom they had to fight to gain freedom and self-government. No one told us in those days that the English had for centuries been climbing the ladder of popular government, even though they had not yet reached the height of extending it to their colonies. No one told us that while we were fighting our Revolution the English people were themselves waging a valiant struggle against the abuse of royal prerogatives. All we were taught was that the English had been our oppressors and that we had been compelled to win our liberties from them by force of arms. When we played our boyhood games of war and glory the enemy was always the British or the Indians, the Redcoats or the Redskins; it didn't much matter which; they were equally bad.

Then something happened. When I was a lad just beginning to think for myself, the United States fought its war with Spain, a war fought for the freedom of an oppressed people outside our boundaries. Like most Americans, young or old, I was shocked by the fact that the countries of continental Europe, almost without exception, sided with Spain. Even such a cradle of liberty as Switzerland was strongly pro-Spanish. I used to be astounded at the letters my sister received from a chum whose father was American Consul in Zurich. But Eng-

land! Ah, England was different. England recognized that the United States was fighting for something in which Englishmen believed, in the right of man to determine his own government. England gave the United States something akin to what the United States is now giving England—every aid short of war. From that day forward, to me and to millions of other Americans, England was no longer the ancient enemy of our liberties; she was the friend of liberty and the friend of the United States.

Do you remember the discussion that ran through the States after the Spanish-American war, advocating an Anglo-American union; not necessarily a political union, but a union of collaboration and co-operation? Perhaps it was discussed in Britain and Canada, too; I wouldn't know. I was a boy, with all of a boy's enthusiasm. I became a devotee of the idea. I still am.

Then came the long years during which peace became a normal condition in most of the civilized world, and Anglo-American friendship came to be taken as a matter of course. I studied a bit of world history during those years, and I needed to be no brilliant student to recognize that the peace was a "Pax Britannica," that respect for the might of England was the major factor in preventing one power from attempting the conquest of another, and that the spectre of what happened to Napoleon was a constant reminder of what would happen to anyone who might again attempt to rule the world by force.

Then came the World War. A man with a Napoleonic complex decided that Britain had lost both her idealism and her political judgment and would stand aside while he made himself master of Europe and perhaps of much of Asia. Millions of Americans believed we should enter the war at once. I was one of them. When the then President said, "We are not concerned with the obscure sources from which it has burst forth," we felt enraged and degraded. We felt, as did Theodore Roosevelt, that the sources were neither obscure nor foreign to us; that in a conflict between freedom and conquest we belonged on the battlefield fighting for freedom. I am convinced that if

Theodore Roosevelt had been President, as but for a turn of politics he might have been, the United States would have been in the war from the beginning, whole-heartedly, with no more dissent than there was when the country finally went in three years later. When the President of the United States tells the country for three years that a certain war is no concern of theirs, some people will come to believe it, and will continue to believe it after the President has changed his mind. The enthusiasm with which the American people threw themselves into the war when President Wilson finally said the word showed that many of them had thought we should be in it all along.

And then the peace, and the refusal of the United States to join the League of Nations. It is too long a story to review now, but I stand here and tell you that on Armistice Day and for months thereafter most Americans favoured the idea of a League and of full American participation in it. What happened that kept the United States out? Chiefly two things: First, Woodrow Wilson had fought the war as though it were not a war of the American people, but a war of the Democratic party. He handled the peace the same way. The commission that he took to Paris was a Democratic commission; not a Republican was on it, not even the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate. The League, God forgive us, became a partisan issue—at a time when the United States was swinging sharply toward Republican normalcy.

The second thing that killed American participation is now represented by the Statute of Westminster. You, yourselves, have taken some time to change your concept from a British Empire to a British Commonwealth of Nations. Is it surprising that after the war, when the concept was new to you, the average American did not grasp it? To be candid, he does not grasp it yet. He still thinks of the British Empire as a unit. So, most of the time, do you. You can imagine the American's reaction, then, to a League of Nations in which the United States would have one vote, the British Empire five. The con-

cept later embodied in the Statute of Westminster may have made Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa free and independent nations, but it helped to kill American participation in the League of Nations. Not all the maladroitness in the handling of the League's promotion was concentrated on the banks of the Potomac.

Even so, the League was not rejected by the American people. They never had a chance to vote on it apart from other and wholly unrelated issues. President Wilson made it an issue in the campaign of 1920 to choose his successor, but it was only a single plank in the platform of his party. The other planks concerned domestic matters, and were not popular. Most Americans, forced to choose between membership in the League and economic policies they feared would be disastrous, forgot the League and voted for economic soundness. I know how they felt, for I was one of them. A strong believer in the League and in American membership in it, I nevertheless voted against the League-sponsoring party in that election. You can see, then, how far the American people were from actually rejecting membership in the League.

So we come to more recent times. I wish we might pass over the years between the Treaty of Versailles and the invasion of Poland. They contain so many mistakes! They are the tragic years. There are those who will say that the only tragic years are the years of battle. I tell you that the years of battle, with all their bloodshed, are the years of courage and sacrifice, of the upsurge of determination that right shall not be banished from the earth. The tragic years are the years of sloth and cynicism, when men come to prize life and ease above right and liberty. Yes, these have been the tragic years, the years when the good wrought from the last war could have been preserved and the evils of the present one avoided, and they were not.

What happened to us during those years? It seems to me that we succumbed to certain dangers inherent in democracy. Like any other product of man's thinking

and evolution, democracy has its dangers. Let us examine some of them.

The first I would name is pacifism. It is an especial danger because it wears a semblance of the ideal of democracy itself. Democracy exalts man, the individual. It proclaims his right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Of these three things, life is tangible, material; liberty and the pursuit of happiness are intangibles, things of the spirit. Pacifism seizes on the tangible thing and exalts it as the whole. It makes man's life and man's right to it the sole thing of importance. In pacifist philosophy he should never be called upon to sacrifice or endanger his life for the sake of the spiritual rights such as liberty and the pursuit of happiness, either his own or those of others. I submit that never in all history has there been a more materialistic philosophy, a doctrine that more clearly exalts bodily well-being above spiritual values. Yet this doctrine, so definitely the negative of Christ's philosophy that "Whosoever would save his life must lose it," lives intimately among us in the garments of Christian idealism, the pet of our women's clubs, the favourite of our schools, and the darling of our churches.

We need not theorize about its dangers. We have only to look back over the past ten years. Because pacifism permeated our thinking and war was considered the only evil in God's sight, the Manchurians and millions of Chinese are slaves to the Japanese, the Ethiopians and the Albanians are slaves to the Italians, and the Czechs, Slovaks, Poles, Danes, Norwegians, Dutch, Belgians, Rumanians, Bulgarians, and French are slaves to the Germans.

The pity of it is that probably war would not have been necessary to prevent all this if our horror of war had not been so great. The watchman seldom has to shoot to prevent the store he guards from being robbed. He needs merely to be armed and prepared to shoot if necessary. If we, and by "we" I mean the believers in democracy, had not told ourselves we must never under any circumstances go to war, and in consequence let ourselves become too weak to fight, we should not have needed

to fight. A strongly-armed England, or a strongly-armed United States, ready to use her strength, could have kept Japan out of Manchuria without doing battle. Italy would not have attacked Ethiopia if the British had been strong instead of weak. Germany would still be within her 1930 boundaries, with or without Hitler, if Britain had not permitted her to rearm and to occupy the Rhineland. No war would have been necessary; all that was needed was the willingness to fight. Hitler would not have given battle; he had nothing to battle with.

We gain nothing by blaming the government then in power. The governments of free peoples, and in fact of all peoples, come pretty close to representing the ideals and desires of the governed. The pacifist government of Britain when Hitler invaded the Rhineland was spirit of our spirit. We all feared war so much that we were unwilling to risk a little war to make a big one impossible. We might have taken to heart a sentence from Machiavelli, "Never permit an evil in order to avoid a war, for the war will come and you will be in poorer case to maintain it." But such common sense was out of date in those pacifist years, and the evil was permitted, the war came, and we were in sad case to maintain it.

The second danger of democracy represents a different type of slipshod sentimentality. We assume that because we are capable of governing ourselves after a fashion and of respecting the rights of our neighbours, all men have the same desire and ability. Nothing could be more false or more dangerous. The art of self-government is not an inherent gift; it is the product of long and painful practice. Those of us who speak the English tongue have taken more than six centuries to achieve it in its present imperfect state. Turn back the pages of history and see how slow our progress has been, how many times we have taken the wrong turn, how often the ideal has seemed to be lost, how hardly won each step has been. Self-government calls for self-discipline, a spirit of fair play, a willingness to accept the will of the majority, no matter how much we may dislike it. Is there any way

in which these things can be learned except through generations spent in the hard school of experience?

Look over the world and count the peoples who have demonstrated their ability to do it. You can count them on the fingers of a single hand: The English-speaking peoples, the Scandinavian peoples through whom the germ of the idea came to England, the Swiss, the Dutch, and the Belgians. That's all. The Czechs and Slovaks made a start, but only a start, in the twenty years they had to try. The Poles stumbled before they got under way. The French? Not yet, though no nation, perhaps, has stronger aspirations. The Third Republic lasted a little more than seventy years, and in that time had something more than sixty-five governments. Such a history does not indicate that the French have yet achieved the political stability required for self-government.

Why is this easy-going belief in self-government as an inherent gift a danger to democracy? Because it leads the democracies to treat other peoples as though they had the same aspirations and ideals. It is leading the United States and Britain toward two steps that will almost certainly cause suffering and bloodshed to those supposed to benefit—the granting of independence to the Philippines and dominion status to India. After the last war it led to something far more dangerous than India or the Philippines can be; it led us to think that the Germans, the Austrians, the Hungarians, and the rest of the world had the same desire and capacity for governing themselves, and for living at peace with their neighbours, that we have, and so it led us directly to the present war. It is a mistake we must not make again. Somehow we shall have to devise a system that will give other peoples a chance to learn the arts of self-government and international honour, and to reap the benefits when they have earned them, but that will guard against their abusing their privileges meanwhile.

These two dangers, pacifism and sentimentality toward other peoples, find a common expression in a third danger, the derogation of what we have done when the doing of

it is over. We have a positive and malign genius for it. The word for it is cynicism. Twenty-odd years ago we fought a righteous war and made a reasonably just peace, but have we told our children so? You know we have not. It has been smart to be cynical about our purposes and our accomplishments. What have our books, our magazines, our teachers, and our preachers been saying for the past two decades? Mainly that the World War was a brutal war, fought by England to prevent Germany from attaining economic equality; that England drew the United States into it to pull her own chestnuts out of the fire; that, whatever its cause, it was a failure and should not have been fought because it failed to establish a perfect world order and a permanent world peace; that the peace treaty was an iniquitous business that wreaked an unjust vengeance and that unwarrantably humiliated a people as proud and deserving as ourselves. Have you read the histories taught in your high schools up almost to to-day? I looked through those my daughter studied last year, in a Canadian high school, mind you. I found little to suggest that the Allies fought the World War in defence of the sacredness of treaties against conquest and oppression; much to suggest that they were actuated by "power politics" and envious economics. I found that the Peace of Versailles was a vengeful peace, unduly hard on Germany, that not only caused but justified the rise of Hitler.

If such things have been taught in Canada, you may be sure they have been taught in the United States. Is it any wonder that, after twenty years of such teaching, the United States should not be in this war? Considering what we have permitted them to be taught, we have every reason to be surprised that the youth of Canada have responded so nobly to freedom's present cry of distress. We may recriminate all we like, but if any of us, on either side of the line, go reluctantly about our duty of defending liberty, we have only ourselves to blame for letting false and cynical teaching mould the minds of our people through the tragic years behind us.

Well, those blind, blundering, tragic years are gone. What of the present and the future?

As to the present, I do not need to tell you that the people of the United States hate Hitler, his associates, and all they stand for as bitterly as do the people of Canada. The lease-lend bill represents far more than a new statute on the books; it represents the grim will and determination of the people.

Do not be unduly disturbed by the thirty-one votes against it in the Senate. Not all were hostile votes. Some, of course, were cast by isolationists, who somehow manage to make a great deal of noise while their heads are buried in the sand. Some were cast by peace-at-any-pricers, a few by men in whom the hostility of 1776 still lingers, some by men who cannot bring themselves to vote with Roosevelt even when they feel that he is right, but some were cast by ardent and loyal friends of Britain. That surprises you, and calls for a word of explanation.

The lease-lend bill gives the President power to give or withhold aid when, to whom, and from whom he chooses. To the extent that American aid is essential in the war, it makes him the arbiter of its destinies. He could conceivably say to Britain or to Greece or to Canada, "Unless you thus and thus conduct the war," or "unless you promise thus and thus to make peace," our aid will be withheld. There are sincere Americans who feel that such power should not lie with the head of a non-belligerent country, but should rest in those who are giving their blood and sweat to the fight; that Joab in the field and not David in Jerusalem should decide whom to place in the forefront of the hottest battle, and when and for what cause to retire from the attack.

Whether they are right or wrong is a question not before us here. Right or wrong, they are lost in the multitude of Americans who are less concerned with such fears than with quick, effective, and overwhelming aid. The voice of that multitude resounds in the lease-lend bill, and their will will be felt in the aid that follows.

Whether the United States will enter the war as a belligerent, and if so when, I know no more than you, but one great fact stands out: Now, already, to-day, the English-thinking peoples are united in a common cause.

As to the future, the thing that concerns me most is how we are going to meet our joint responsibilities during the post-war years. On us, the English-thinking peoples, will rest the chief burden of planning and maintaining the post-war world. How shall we plan and maintain it? No human mind can foresee what will need to be done, or how it should be done, but I think we can agree on a few fundamentals.

We should have learned by now that no world order will function safely on international honour alone; not until all the peoples involved have attained, through generations of practice, to common standards of self-government and international honesty. Until that time, the world will need a police force powerful enough to prevent international robbery. Nations are much like individuals. So long as there are criminals and potential criminals there must be police. When private crime ceases and police are no longer needed, then international peace may maintain itself on an honour basis. Meanwhile peace, like personal honesty, must be enforced. Who, then, shall enforce it?

From a coldly practical standpoint, the safest and most pleasant world to live in for the next fifty years would be one in which peace was enforced jointly by the English-speaking nations. The British and Americans are not saints nor are they above selfishness, and there would be deviations from strict fairness and justice, but on the whole the policing would be honest, fair, and effective. The mere suggestion, however, would throw every non-English patriot and most English-speaking idealists into spasms. It would be made to sound like tyranny of the worst sort. The idea is so coldly practical as to be wholly impractical.

It is not impossible, however, to conceive of some sort of association to which all people who have shown themselves capable of self-government and who have a reasonably long record of international honesty would be admit-

ted on an equal footing, each having a voice in its affairs and contributing to its joint police force—an association to which other nations might be admitted if and when they have given evidence of the necessary qualifications. Such an association could be set up as soon as peace is achieved. The requisites for its success would be the self-discipline and honour necessary for any form of self-government, plus the adequacy of its police force for any situation and an unhesitating willingness to use it, and a realistic attitude with respect to further admissions. If pacifistic philosophy should weaken its power or its will to use that power, or if sentimentality should lead it to open its gates to a preponderance of unfit, the end would be chaos.

Please do not think I am trying to lay down a plan for a post-war system. I have little faith in planned economies or planned world orders. I believe success in social and political systems comes only through evolution, through trial, error, and never-ending amendment.

My only object in what I have said is to emphasize that after the war there will be a peace to make and enforce, that the responsibility for making and enforcing it will fall chiefly on the English-thinking nations, and that only as they see together, think together, and act together can lasting peace and justice be achieved.

Can we do it and avoid the errors of the past? Let us study again the fumbled years since the Armistice and the pitfalls into which we fell.

We must avoid, if we would save the world, the re-criminations that rubbed the sores of the last war. This time let no flamboyant American cry, "We won the war," and let no impatient Canadian answer, "Why didn't you come in before the war was over?" However much we may argue, as argue we shall, over tariffs, trade rivalries and such things, we must hold fast to the comradeship that a common enemy and a common danger have given us.

Britain, let us speak frankly, must avoid even the appearance of acquisitiveness. At the end of the last war there were those who said, with the appearance rather than the substance to justify them, that Great Britain had

fought a selfish, not an idealistic war, because she emerged from it with enlarged territories. This time, if Anglo-American unity of sentiment is to be preserved, she must so conduct the peace that no one may accuse her of having profited.

The United States, for her part, must abandon all thought of isolation. It may be hard for you, Canadians, to realize how difficult a task this may be. As citizens of a world-wide Empire you have always been world-minded. The tradition of the United States for a hundred and fifty years has been one of isolation. Because of her vast area and her self-contained economy she has not needed to look to world affairs. Millions of her people have never seen an ocean or an ocean-going ship. For generations her safety and her welfare lay in Washington's admonition to "avoid entangling alliances." She finds it hard to realize how great she has grown and how small the world has shrunk. She is not yet fully awake to the responsibility that her wealth and her strength have thrust upon her. She still wonders whether she cannot live in a world apart, with no participation in the world outside her borders. Yet awaken she must, and live fully in the larger world in which she finds herself, and shoulder her full share of its responsibilities, if she would escape the disorder and turmoil of a world that cannot be organized without her.

Lastly, in the years that lie ahead, we must avoid the stumbling weaknesses of the years behind, pacifism, the sentimental assumption that all people share our aspirations and have learned our lessons of self-discipline, and the cynical decrying of our own ideals and purposes.

These are the requisites for a future of peace and safety. Whatever world system or arrangement is based on them may not be perfect, but it will have a foundation permitting it to grow toward perfection. No system or organization that is based on less will live long enough to grow.

And these, mark you, are the requisites of strength, a strength that, when this war is over, will remain only to the English-thinking nations in unison. No one of them,

Great Britain, Canada, Australia, or the United States, will alone have the strength for the task. Peace, no less than victory, will require all that we can give in a common cause.

Thus, inevitably, we come to our final conclusion: If the nations that speak the English tongue continue after the war to work in harmony for their common ideals, the future, despite all the waste and woe of the present, may well be a happy one. If, on the other hand, Great Britain should swing toward a policy of acquisition or the United States return to a policy of isolation, or if pacifism or sentimental idealization of other peoples or cynicism toward their own ideals should again weaken their moral fibre, I shudder for the world in which our children and our grandchildren may have to live.

Let us pray God, then, as we have never prayed before, that not death nor life nor principalities nor powers nor things present nor things to come nor height nor depth nor any other creature may ever again separate the spirits of the peoples who revere the English tradition.

MR. E. F. THOMPSON: We have another oil authority in the room—the Federal Oil Controller, Mr. G. L. Cottrelle, who has consented to thank the speaker.

MR. COTTRELLE: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: As most, if not all of you, have read in the papers, a well known and accepted oil authority made the statement when I was appointed Oil Controller, that I was simply another banker that had gone down to Ottawa and got myself a nice easy, soft job, and that I was entirely incompetent. Being easily beaten and looking crestfallen, no doubt, a friend of mine gave me the book written by Max Ball, called "Oil". I read it, and while I cannot say that it gave me the key to the administration of my job, I found it interesting. I recommend it. You will find that Mr. Ball is an authority.

Oil, as you have seen or know, is the life-blood of the army, the navy and the air force. It is an all-important

subject, and I think everyone should read Max Ball's book on oil.

When I was appointed Oil Controller, the 28th of June last, I was told there was lots of oil in the West. As a matter of fact, certain people gave me an outline and the suggestion that my first job was to get a pipe-line to Sarnia or the coast or somewhere else. Since that time I have been looking for the oil and it may interest you to know that there aren't enough known reserves in Alberta or in the West to supply the market on the basis of last year's market, for the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan and the demands of British Columbia and Manitoba, as far east as Portage la Prairie.

Now, I am looking to Mr. Ball to dig me out of my difficulty. Mr. Ball, with his tenacity and experience will in all probability, and it is my belief that he will whip the problem in harvesting and producing oil from the Abasand in Northern Alberta. Mr. Ball may easily become a well known and renowned authority for having made one of the greatest contributions that this country has had in this war effort.

Your Chairman was good enough to do me the honour to ask me to express the appreciation of this Club to Mr. Ball for coming here to-day, and I think I would be lax in my duty if I did not make one comment, and that is this: The people of Canada, Mr. Ball, are not in the least anxious about the power of the President of the United States. We have every confidence that he will not let us down. (Applause.) But I think I should say that if for any unknown reason the President of the United States should withdraw his support, the people of England and the people of Canada will fight the battle until we get rid of this rat.

Mr. Ball, I have pleasure in thanking you on behalf of the Empire Club for your very instructive address and for coming to us to-day. (Applause.)

"TWO THOUSAND YEARS OF DEMOCRACY"

AN ADDRESS BY

HENRY PETERSON.

Chairman: Mr. J. C. M. MacBeth, K.C.

Thursday, April 3, 1941

A call for registration for service of all automobile drivers at their nearest Police or Fire Station, so that arrangements might be made to have them available for Air Raid Precaution transportation by the Civilian Defence Committee in case of necessity, was read out emanating from Mr. Tracey D. LeMay on behalf of the City of Toronto.

MR. J. C. M. MACBETH: Gentlemen, in the continued absence of the Honourable Mr. Ferguson, the members of the Executive Committee have been passing around the honour of presiding at the weekly luncheon and to-day the lot has fallen to me. It is quite an unusual instance that we should have the privilege of listening to an address on China by a gentleman born in that country.

He has, however, added to that Oriental origin a long residence in England and many years of travel elsewhere—a fit subject for a profound controversy for international jurists on the question of domicile. I strongly urge him never to allow the issue to come before the courts for decision in a matrimonial cause.

It is not to be wondered at that he has made a special study of his country or origin, its political, social and economic affairs and its literature. He spent the years 1938 to 1940 in China as the guest of the Government and

is well qualified to speak with authority on recent developments there, if indeed, 1940 can be said to be recent in this swiftly-moving world.

He is a writer of note. One of his articles "Singapore" appeared in a recent issue of a Canadian magazine, another entitled "Hitler Will Attack Russia" appeared just last week, and there is promise of another shortly on the characteristic signs of Hitlerian strategy which point to such attack. He is the author of *Honourable and Peculiar Ways*—the title suggests Pacific diplomacy—and in 1923 he collaborated with the Earl of Halsbury, son of the doughty law lord, in publishing the novel *1944*, in anticipation of the then next "World War".

Gentlemen, I have much pleasure in introducing the guest-speaker, Mr. Henry Peterson, the subject of whose address is "Two Thousand Years of Democracy".

MR. HENRY PETERSON: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: May I say how much I appreciate the privilege and how much I welcome the opportunity to address a club with so pregnant a name to-day as the Empire Club.

Not only in the British Empire but in every vital spot on earth, mankind to-day is searching, is passionately searching, for a better way of life.

Throughout his stubborn career, man has been able to learn only by the hard way. To-day, a greater area of our golden earth, a greater multitude of souls, is drenched in tears than ever the friendly sun has ever mocked at before. Therefore, we are arrived at one of man's humbler periods, when he is not too proud to look beyond his short nose, when he will go abroad to search for a new salvation.

But where and how to start? One of the greatest men that ever walked this earth, the Emperor T'ang T'ai Tsung of China, who at eighteen founded the most glorious of her dynasties by putting his father on the throne with his sword, threw off many penetrating sayings concerning man. Said this giant who ever subordinated his sword to the Moral Law, thirteen hundred years ago: "In a mirror of brass you may see to adjust your head-dress, but in a

mirror of antiquity you can see the rise and fall of empires."

In my own humble search in the history of many peoples to find some sane, some workable solution to our modern wants, I must confess I have been most enlightened by the saga of the Chinese people. It gives us, at least, authentic evidence, evidence we can touch, see and hear, taste and very much smell. The ways of life of Egypt, Babylon, Greece and Rome, even of recent Byzantium, have all been mercilessly ploughed under by Nature.

But China, old before even Greece first saw the light, still strides the golden earth, still enjoys the friendly sun, still finds rejuvenation when hammered by a neighbour less civilized. Here is a way of life that works. Why and how has it worked?

I venture to think that the other old civilizations were ploughed under because they evolved a way of living which was not adapted to man's nature. They all had a religion which satisfied the heart but not the head, and a philosophy which satisfied the head but not the heart. Confucius gave the Chinese people a way of life which satisfies both head and heart.

Significantly to-day, in that other land of tough survival, in that deep-thinking land, joyous in adversity, England, a body of honest men and women are meeting, at the Malvern Congress, to bridge this very gulf in its life between head and heart. They are searching for nationality, which shows up clear and steady in T'ang T'ai Tsung's mirror as Nature's first demand of man if he wants to survive.

Here one vital aspect of our modern extremism should be examined—our belief that our ills are basically economic, transcending political and social factors. The Chinese saga points to a different conclusion—that both political and economic good are merely the means and not the end to man's adventure, which is social contentment—personal liberty coming before the rice bowl, and not the stomach before human dignity.

So let us see what China's political history is. From the misty horizon of legend until four thousand years ago the people were ruled by priest-kings, semi-elected by themselves. Then, primitive morality decaying, rugged individualism was born—the man with the biggest fist snatching most power and handing it down to descendants, until the mighty Chou dynasty tried to safeguard kingly power by creating the feudal system, which lasted nine hundred years, from 1150 B.C. until 249 B.C.—its exact replica appearing in Europe over two thousand years later.

Rotten with petty pride, it was destroyed by the world's first totalitarian régime. In its last four hundred and fifty years while thirteen of the fourteen states were slaughtering one another, the fourteenth, the Ch'in State, in the west, kept to itself behind its mountain ranges, developing a continuous policy free from idealism, intensely exploiting its rich natural resources. To it had flocked brilliant men from the other states, disgusted with slaughter. By 270 B.C. a perfect machine of government and an invincible war machine had been produced, and a generation later a man of monster proportions was on the throne. One by one he conquered his cretinous squabbling neighbours and styled himself the First Universal Emperor—Ch'in Shi Huang Ti—but was prouder of another title, the Great Modern.

All books, except those on agriculture, war and economics, science, engineering and medicine, were ordered to be burnt, and some four thousand scholars, refusing to give up the books by Confucius, went up in their flames. Having killed the feudal system by abolishing the nobility and confiscating their lands, the great destroyer sought to found a modern empire by creating a civil service of modern-minded young men culled from every class of the conquered. So he instituted competitive examinations for selected candidates—good party men. And suppression of individual liberty was even more thorough and inhuman than that practised by to-day's hasty imitations of totalitarianism which are but gangsters' rackets,

whereas the Ch'in breaking of souls was carried out by a civil service of impeachable integrity.

Here history gives one of its ironic chuckles. In creating competitive civil service examinations, the totalitarian had put China on the first step to democracy, had given the first limited trial of the very first tenet of just government propounded by his arch-enemy, Confucius, though dead two hundred and fifty years—that there should be even reward of merit throughout the land.

Unwilling to be bent into machines, the people utterly destroyed the system in a universal revolt fifteen years after the universal conquest, suffering ghastly punishment, pitchforks against chariots. And this invincible surging up of the human spirit established another of Confucius' fundamental tenets of just government—that the people have the right to revolt under injustice, substituting a good ruler for a bad one, even by the executioner's axe. Since then the Chinese people have persistently exercised that right. While England, France and Russia have each had only one epoch-making revolution, China has had twenty-five since Confucius, each destroying in order to create.

In our present search for a good definition of democracy have we yet found a better one than a system of government which is circumscribed by these two inalienable rights of the common man—fair opportunity to rise to the highest offices in the land and power of execution of a bad ruler? Do these two rights not form the very roof and foundation of the mansion we to-day call democracy? China has seen the death of her early playmates on earth primarily because of these safeguards of the common man.

What happened when the totalitarian system collapsed? The conquering dynasty, the Han, while recreating noble rank, also expanded qualifications for the civil service examinations to embrace the whole nation, yet, of course, it was not until printing was invented a few centuries later that large numbers of sons of peasants rose and stepped into an aristocracy of talent. For the last seventeen centuries this aristocracy of talent has been the cement binding together the Chinese organism.

But the search for political and economic panaceas did not die two thousand years ago. Between 9 B.C. and 25 A.D. a usurper seized the Han throne and tried to put into practice a most astonishing system—a stark socialism based on a revival of feudal forms. All land was seized and was called “royal land”, which the usurper then divided among those willing to follow him. Next came complete state control of the country’s economy—control of production and sale of all commodities and their distribution. Reform followed reform to make this combination of feudalism and socialism work. After thirty-four years of it, of growing chaos, the people turned and rent it to pieces, stuck the head of the king of “isms” on a pole and stoned it until it fell to the ground for scavenger dogs to finish off.

After that, for two hundred years the even reward of merit went on under autocratic rule, hand in hand with savage rebellions when taxes became oppressive. Then for four hundred years rugged individualism went completely mad, taking in its stride the Wars of the Three Kingdoms, which produced perhaps the most intense fighting the world has even seen, for over a period of eighty years.

We are now getting nearer Confucius, to what democratic morality must be, yet I am afraid we must first look into still another grand attempt at an economic panacea. It took place around 1066, and can best be described as “Communism and All That”. The conditions were ideal. A brilliant Minister of State laid before his Emperor a scheme which would modernize the state. It was as simple as it was promising. To quote his own words: “The State should take the entire management of commerce, industry and agriculture into its own hands, with the view to succouring the working classes, and preventing their being ground to the dust by the rich.” Convinced, the able and honest Emperor gave his support. Land, seed and implements were given away free of charge, and boards of experts criss-crossed the land giving advice free and organizing free state transportation. In only a score of years this peaceful revolution which aimed

at "preventing there being any poor or over-rich persons in the State" came to an end. His heart broken, but not his honesty, the Emperor admitted that it had only been a cruel dream. The weaknesses of human nature, he had learnt, were stronger than the most perfect system pen could put on paper.

Individualism had now lost its rugged savagery, for it now firmly grasped in its right hand the sword of the civil service examinations, and in its left hand the shield of the right to revolt under injustice. The internal conditions of survival had been established.

Yet even Utopia itself cannot survive unless its frontiers can be maintained against external attack. Here one of the myths concerning the Chinese people needs attention—that they have been conquered many times and have always absorbed their conquerors.

The Chinese are not so simple, and one has only to ask what would have happened to them had they developed the habit of being conquered? No nation has fought so long and therefore so well as the Chinese against aggressors. The absorption idea has truth only in so far as that, until the Western Powers appeared, every aggressor had been of an inferior culture and could not come in contact with Chinese civilization without falling a willing victim to it.

War was a ripe art in China before that shining handful of Greeks stood at Thermopylae. In fact, five full centuries before Thermopylae, her frontiers had been guarded by a standing army; organized warfare alone saved her from the ceaseless and merciless invasions of the Huns for seventeen long centuries, and there were a dozen other marauders skirting the frontiers with their senses aflame with tales of Chinese silks, luxuries and the beauty of the women.

As Confucius gave the Chinese people democracy, so a general—fatefully enough, living in the same generation—has given them the gift of generalship in war. For twenty-five centuries the Chinese have had his treatise, called the *Art of War*, at their side, which contains no

more than seven thousand crisp words. I believe I have only to quote a few sentences and your minds will leap to Hitler's smashing of the French Army. First, I must tell you that the German Staff College has been studying this ancient treatise ever since 1919 when it set out to search for the causes of the German Army's defeat in the last war—and went back to first principles. I had better also say that for these twenty-five centuries every one of China's great soldiers has been a disciple of this man, Sun Tzu. And in these twenty-five centuries Chinese fighting can show a score of generals every bit as gifted as Napoleon.

First I will quote you what may be called the three chief props of Sun Tzu's philosophy of war, "All warfare is based on deception." In no other treatise on war anywhere is this very breadth of generalship stated in this categorical manner. The second prop is: "In war the way is to avoid what is strong and to strike at what is weak." The third: "Rapidity is the essence of war." Nothing can be more obvious, yet we clever moderns on both sides in the last war reversed all three precepts nearly all the time, and I don't have to remind you that Hitler's victories have been due to a scrupulous obedience to all three.

I am much tempted to quote more on the purely military plane, but I shall spare you that, yet I believe you will be interested in something on the political plane, an uncanny description of how Hitler built his corner-stone in capturing Czechoslovakia—the slipway that launched the blitzkrieg in France.

"When a warlike prince attacks a powerful State, his generalship shows itself in preventing the concentration of the enemy's forces. He overaws his opponents, and their allies are prevented from joining against him. Hence he does not strive to ally himself with all and sundry, nor does he foster the power of other States. He carries out his secret designs, and keeps his opponents in awe. Thus, he is able to capture their cities and overthrow their kingdoms."

Yet is corruption of the enemy on Hitler's scale not totally new in warfare?

Sun Tzu says: "Reduce the hostile chiefs by inflicting damage on them; make trouble for them, and make servants of them. Hold out specious allurements, and make them hasten in our direction."

Twelve hundred years ago one of Sun Tzu's several hundred commentators, a scholar by the name of Chia Lin, expanded this passage thus:

"Entice away the enemy's best and wisest men, so that he may be left without councillors. Introduce traitors into his country, that the government policy may be rendered futile. Foment intrigue and deceit, and thus sow dissension between the ruler and his ministers. By means of every artful contrivance, cause deterioration amongst his men and waste of his treasure. Corrupt his morals by insidious gifts leading him to excess. Disturb and unsettle his mind by presenting him with lovely women."

Is this not a telling example of the breadth, depth and continuity of the Chinese mind? It has to do only with war, but one can imagine how like dripping water has been the search for rational solutions to political, economic and social problems, wearing out the hardest obstacles.

I have taken the risk of boring you to emphasize the Chinese capacity for war for two vital democratic reasons: to show that a people must be virile concerning war if it is to survive; and that excessive fighting alone can give birth to democracy. Because the people get tired of being cannon fodder—because the inalienable right of civilized men is just freedom to maintain his small rhythm of survival, which cannot be made up of cruelty, corruption and conquest, but of love, labour and leisure. That inalienable right was what killed the Great Modern's totalitarian system and will kill Hitler's, for it is armed with the most destructive weapon at all times—the Moral Law—which the German General Staff may be remembering Sun Tzu indirectly puts at no less than six to one as against the physical factors in war.

So now we can turn to the spiritual factors that have maintained democracy in China.

The first is a very remarkable one. The Chinese

appear on the pages of history a highly moral (agricultural) people. Up to the present no traces have been found of their having ever been nomads; but, far more important, there is no trace of their having ever glorified Might as being over Right, and there is the evidence of their written language. Even in the middle of their blood-stained feudal period, in the year 597 B.C.—forty-six years before Confucius was born—Prince Chuang of the State of Ch'u, proclaimed: "The ideograph for 'prowess' is made up of the signs 'to stay' and a 'Spear'—in other words, the cessation of hostilities." He goes on, "Military prowess is seen in the repression of cruelty, the calling in of weapons and the preservation of the appointment of Heaven, the firm establishment of merit, the bestowal of happiness on the people, the putting of harmony between the princes, and the diffusion of wealth." War has always been defined by these long-livers as punishment, being one of the functions of government.

It is now time to approach the very yellow earth of this persistent race, something on which even Chiang Kai-Shek's New Life Movement to-day has to be founded—the five Cardinal Virtues of the Chinese, which have come down from the very dawn of the race and may be called the five commandments of the Chinese people.

The first is Humanity or Benevolence; the second is Uprightness of Mind; the third is Self-Respect, Self-Control or "Proper Feeling"; only number four is Wisdom; and the fifth is Sincerity or Good Faith.

You will observe that every one is ethical, there is no mention of morality. But do these five ethical demands not make up the best definition we can have for the Moral Law?

Yet there is something strange, I believe, unique, in this matter of morality about the Chinese. They gave up religion as a moral force thirty-five hundred years ago and have since welcomed every religion from without seeking their hospitality, so long as proselyters remain good citizens of the land.

What did Confucius teach? Confucius sought the

rational organization of the world and based his whole system on the natural sympathy of men for one another—on love. Man, he argued, is born good and only goes wrong when he doesn't listen to his own conscience, that most honest thing known to men.

Four steps were necessary to the rational organization of the world: 1. Cultivation of the Individual; 2. Organization of the Family; 3. Administration of the State; 4. Pacification of the World.

The whole system was founded on the individual, whose conduct must rest on the precept: "Do not unto others what you would not have done unto you."

The obligations natural to the family should be extended to the state, and the obligations natural to the state extend to the world. But how is this universal duty to be achieved? By means of education. The aim is wholly ethical, its end the highest good for the greatest number—there always being black sheep.

But how is even the very first step to be attained—the responsibility of the individual, which is the all-embracing principle, the unbroken thread that runs through the system? By the correct definition of names.

Now, a name is not an empty word. It has a distinct, clearly-defined meaning, for accident has given reality fixed associations, through names. Basic names like father and son, husband and wife, prince and minister, when correctly defined, fix fields of duty. Only then do individuals enjoy the rights implied in their names. Hence the sum total of clearly-defined names makes up a clearly-defined system of human society, since every individual has a position corresponding to his name, he enjoys a personal inviolable dignity within the limits of the rights and duties of that name.

Yet because of backsliding, there must be rules to determine the individual's behaviour proper to his position. These rules are to be made clear in the rites. Neither compulsion nor persuasion must be used to enforce their performance. The idea of these ceremonies is that habit

based on the free recognition of their justification automatically brings fulfillment of duty.

I would like to stop a moment and ask if this isn't very much the principle of the English public schools—from Eton to Eastbourne—with their quiet but inviolable ritual to produce good form?

Yet how are relative ranks to be fixed in society? By an *absolute moral authority*, so that there need be no dispute between high and low. Thus each individual, by first obeying this absolute moral authority, next by basing his relation with his neighbour on love and then keeping within the rights and duties of his name, will bring harmony to human society.

This, in a few inadequate words, may be called the Confusian ethic. Yet, a question must be on your lips—what is the authority behind the absolute moral authority? Confucius was alive to such a need. He was too sceptical to believe that the metaphysical world, which he privately revered spending days on end alone in prayer, worshipping Heaven, could influence human conduct. Religion or force was also out of the question, for the conduct of his princely man, or gentleman (in the proper broad use of that term) must be based on no ulterior motive—either hope of reward or fear of punishment nor on compulsion, but only on pure reverence of the good, as a thing in itself. So Confucius made his absolute moral authority something which could give no scope for objections—on the conduct of the long-idealized rulers, Yao and Shun, the elected Emperors of antiquity who had wrought wisely and unselfishly two thousand years earlier.

Now I think we can see why totalitarianism, socialism or communism, or even degenerate despotic emperors have been unable to kill democracy in China since its birth two thousand years ago. Not only did Confucius give his people individual liberty but he took pains to safeguard that liberty by the only two means that can safeguard individual liberty—not only the right to revolt when his rulers, forgetting their rights and duties, made social injustice indecent and intolerable; but by education, to see

that individual liberty shall not degenerate into individual licence. The common man has his duties as well as his rights.

One more concrete factor of China's survival must be proclaimed, a tremendous factor—for twelve hundred years democracy there could not be sold to profiteers.

During that glorious T'ang dynasty, which threw up four thousand first-class poets in three hundred years, a most astonishing law was passed, the wisest law that man ever made. At that time alchemy was a raging science—that beginning of man's inquisitive search into Nature's laws and properties. Abruptly scientific research came to an end. It went to Arabia, whence it travelled on to Europe. What had happened? That law had proscribed it. It stated that any man inventing any machine or instrument which went faster than the pace of human life would be put to death, and was.

I venture to think that those T'ang rulers saw what the end of science might be—the destruction of man. To-day Europe, having fashioned out of Chinese alchemy Western science, would give a great deal to have had that law made universal throughout the world even a quarter of a century ago.

It is now too late for the world to adopt China's backward law of survival, but should we not take to ourselves the spiritual kernel of that survival and give up our iconoclastic concept of relativity in human morality?

Let modern democracy reflect on this passion for relativity in human affairs and remember that the world's one deathless democracy has survived through the recognition of an absolute moral authority in human conduct. (Applause.)

PROFESSOR C. T. CURRELLY: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Peterson and Gentlemen: I have been asked to say a few words to express our gratitude for this very wonderful and very delightful résumé of four thousand years of history and the philosophy that lies behind it. It has been a wonderful thing to have put before us in these very few

minutes such an enormous epoch of history and to have explained that philosophy which is the basal thing underlying the outcome of everything.

I felt so much pleased with the final part where the question came up of discipline. I was very much impressed when a very prominent statesman in England said some time ago: "After this war the common boy of England will have the same chances of education as the boy at Eton." I think he has now but he hasn't the discipline, and you will never get an Eton boy until you get Eton discipline, and we will never get it in Canada nor anywhere else until we get that discipline, perhaps most easily based, as it is in China, on the family, or as it so often is in England, on the school. But it has to be there.

I am so glad that you have been able to put forward to us at this time, in such a perfectly charming manner, this most important side of life, for we will have to face it during the next quarter of a century. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

“OFF THE RECORD”

AN ADDRESS BY

COLONEL W. J. DONOVAN.

Chairman: The First Vice-President, Mr. C. R. Sanderson.

Thursday, April 10, 1941

MR. C. R. SANDERSON: Gentlemen, this meeting will derive a great deal of its value because it is strictly off the record, and therefore if there are members of the press present we hope they will observe the courtesies of the meeting.

The whole of the English-speaking world knows Colonel Donovan. But his missions have taken him to many another country which will have cause to thank him for what he has done, is doing and will do.

Colonel Donovan has done so much that is of great importance. And anyone who presents to a meeting which already knows him a man who has had the career that Colonel Donovan has had can pick out only one or two things to say. But one measure of his achievement on one side of his life is that he is the only soldier of the United States Army who obtained all three honours in the last war. (Applause.) He was given the Congressional Medal of Honour, the Distinguished Service Cross and the Distinguished Medal. Yet Colonel Donovan is not a professional soldier.

Neither is he a professional diplomat. He is a lawyer. And as a lawyer he has risen to great heights in his profession. He gained an Assistant Attorney-Generalship.

Yet somehow he gives the appearance of always having been trying to evade his profession as a lawyer by acting as a soldier-diplomat. He was in Ethiopia in 1934 and

1935 when Italy had a little job on there which I think she has since regretted. He was in Spain as an observer with Franco's Army. He is back from a twenty-five thousand mile trip (we won't talk in figures, but that is a lot of distance) for the Secretary of the Navy of the United States, during which he covered the theatres of war not only in Europe but also in Africa. There he met people whose names are before us so much to-day, including Churchill and Wavell, in personal, close, intimate contact. And to-day in this "off the record" talk he is going to say some of the things that are in his mind, and, Gentlemen, I think we shall find they are exactly the things that are in our minds. Colonel Donovan! (Prolonged standing applause.)

COLONEL W. J. DONOVAN: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: I know that you, as the men who are interested in the welfare of our country, are thirsty for information as to what is going on, on the revolutionary battlefields of Europe. I am going to talk to you simply, frankly, as I wish to establish certain principles in your minds, with which you may be better able to understand the day-to-day movement of the troops abroad. I think the danger with all of us is that we try to listen to all the spot-news and go up and down like a thermometer in our emotions having nothing real to hang on to, whether it be reassuring or whether it be disturbing. And I think perhaps the best thing to do is to begin at the beginning and explain how I happened to be there and see what I have seen.

Last July I was one of those in America who were anxious to see that our Conscription Bill was put through and I was before the Military Affairs Committee of both the House and the Senate. While there one day I was called to the White House and I found there the Secretaries of State, of the Navy and of the Army with the President, and I was asked, because of disturbing news that had come from South America, if I would be willing to go and see what I could learn of fifth column activities abroad and the way in which England had been handled.

When I said I would, there were several departments of our Government that asked me to do certain tasks for them.

I went to England and I had the opportunity there of making a study, through the information that had been obtained, of just how Germany had gradually disintegrated the underlying foundations of the various countries that she subsequently attacked. I also went about among the men of the Army and Navy and tried at the same time to get some comprehension of the economic and financial problems that arose from this war. Now out of that I came back with three impressions.

The first was that while there might be some kind of an improvised attack by the Germans in an attempted invasion of England, Germany did not at the beginning of the war have it in her mind that this would be necessary because Germany had believed that she would be able to destroy the British Army in France. When she failed in that, she then, out of her resourcefulness, attempted to build up an effort of invasion. How far that effort went, I doubt if anyone really knows, but it failed as told to me by General Gort who was then in command of the British Army of Defence. It failed for two reasons: first, because her efforts in September failed by a slight margin of their objective, and second because of her lack of fighting planes to protect her barges on which her soldiers were loaded, battened down under hatches.

Now the second impression I had was that the shipping problem would be the serious problem, and I thought too many of those in important positions in England were underrating the effect of air, submarine, raider and mine attack upon the shipping of England, and I think that has been borne out by what we find is a serious situation of shipping to-day.

The third thing was that it was not sufficient that England should be able to defend herself in the event of invasion but that it would be necessary for her to take the initiative in a new theatre of operation which it seemed to me had to be the Middle East.

Now I came back and reported those facts and subsequently, with the Secretary of the Navy, I went out with our Navy on manoeuvres. At that time a low state of mind existed not only among us but with many of you people here—I came here during that period to view your state of preparation—and I learned then that so many of our people had not much knowledge of the geography of the countries or of that part of the world that was east of the Straits of Gibraltar. So in December of last year I met with those same members of our Government, together with Lord Lothian, and they asked if I would be willing to go and see what I could of the Mediterranean and its implications in the Atlantic and the Pacific.

So I went and talked to Mr. Churchill and I said to him that I thought it was time for both of us—his people and our own people—to try and develop a body of experts to study the economic, political and military implications of the Mediterranean that would be common to both countries and to try and have an appreciation of German intentions in that theatre because that theatre could not be considered other than in relation to the entire strategic front. He agreed and he picked one of the very best British officers to go with me and we took this little odyssey. We went to Gibraltar, where I found some Canadian miners helping in the preparation of the defence of the Rock. We went to Malta which had been written off by the British themselves as not being able to bear the first two weeks of the war but is still there as a repair base for cruisers and destroyers. We went to Cairo where I spent some three weeks on the Western desert; then to south-eastern Europe where we went to Bulgaria and Jugoslavia and spent a week on the Greek positions; then to Africa, back to Malta, Gibraltar, Spain, Portugal, back to England and finally home.

Now there are certain questions that I know must be in your minds, and the primary question I imagine is that which arises out of the news that you are reading day by day. I know at times it must be very discouraging to you

to find that in south-eastern Europe there should be such an easy advance by the Germans at Salonika. Let me tell you this, that the British leaders there took into account all the dangers they would run by going in and standing beside Greece at the moment that Germany had determined she needed Salonika, and I think it is the greatest credit to Britain that she elected to stand beside her fighting Ally in that dangerous moment. (Applause.)

Now let us see what Germany's purpose is in south-eastern Europe. As you know, from observing the course of economic and political history over the last ten years, Germany has been trying to take all the Balkans within her economic orbit and she has been doing that by means of an exchange—a forced exchange very often—of her manufactured goods for the food and the raw materials of that section of the world. Now it was an essential thing for her in this war to have the Balkans tranquil and quiet. I remember, just five weeks before the war began, I was in Germany and I talked on two or three occasions to the Chief of Operations of the German General Staff and I said to him, "Why do you people want Italy as an Ally instead of her remaining neutral, because as an Ally you will have a weak flank which can be pounded by the British and French Fleets." He said, "We think we can take care of the British and French Fleets, but what we need is what we did not have in the last war, and that is a bastion for a Balkan bread basket."

Now if that reason is still valid—and I think we have seen how important the Germans think it is—it was vital for them to have peace through the Balkan area. So you found that during these last eighteen months—just as in ancient days before the taking of a city the enemy would seep underneath the walls—there has been a gradual seeping, supported by intimidation, of these various nations of the Balkans, so that by out-flanking and then coercing, each would fall without a fight. Greece alone stood out, and undoubtedly Germany kept her hand off Greece but used ancient Italy to do the job, because at the same time, by remaining at peace with Greece, Germany was able to

get the food and other supplies that she needed from Greece during that period.

Now I happened to be in the Balkans from about the middle of January through all of February and I saw these things going on, and it was very clear that Germany was determined that one day she was going to take Salonika for two reasons. From an offensive standpoint, because if she had Salonika together with the Dodecanese Islands which Italy now holds, and Sicily, she would have a chance to make her fight for domination of the Mediterranean; and secondly for a defensive reason because she undoubtedly felt there would be a danger of Britain together with other Balkan nations using Salonika as a jumping-off place for an attack against Rumania, which is really Germany's solar plexis because of the oil in that area. So she was governed by those two principles. And it was necessary for her to isolate Greece. She got Bulgaria, and then she was able to get the politicians of Yugoslavia, but not the soldiers. Now this man who is the head of the Yugoslavian Government to-day is the head of the Air Force and he is a good straight-fighting fellow. I remember when I got to Cairo I got word that Sir Anthony Eden and General Dill were coming, and would I remain to see them. I did and I said, "You take a look at this man, he is a good fighting man and he may be of use to you." I think no matter how Germany may overwhelm Yugoslavia, you will find those fellows fighting, even though they may be inadequate in arms and equipment.

The situation in Greece was an interesting one to me, because as I said before, the Greek fought with a rock, a mule and a rifle. The rock was his parapet, the mule was the means by which he carried the supplies and the rifle was the means of offence and defence. If he needed a machine-gun he went over and took it from the Italians. As a matter of fact, the real arsenal of that section of democracy was Italy. (Applause.)

Now speaking of that leads me to a consideration of another question. I think we are all inclined to make the mistake of looking upon the Mediterranean solely as a

great arterial highway running between the British Isles and India. When you go home take your map and look at it in a different way. Look at it in the North and South axis, then you will find that you have a better understanding of it. You take the Mediterranean as a "No Man's Land" between two lines of trenches, the northern being the European continent held almost completely by Germany but in which the British have a bridge-head still in Greece—and the southern being the African continent which the British had largely held, except for a dangerous line in Tripoli still held by Italy which could be widened and which is now being widened, is the greatest point of danger in future. So the fight is between those two countries then for domination of the Mediterranean. What Germany is trying to do is to seal up the Mediterranean by domination of the air, and having sealed it, then to block it up. England, on the other hand, if she can attain domination—as she nearly completely had until the Germans came in and then, as Admiral Cunningham said to me "We have to start all over again, but by God, we are going to do it!"

Now let me tell you this: I know you gentlemen are disturbed by the loss of Salonika, but I say to you this, that the British and the Greek allies never intended to make a fight for Salonika: they knew they couldn't. They knew first they could not get troops in time to the Bulgarian frontier and they knew, secondly, it would take too heavy a detachment of troops to make that part of the fight through Greece. So that the movement there is simply a holding movement and when you read in the paper there are "300,000 Greeks captured" it is a ridiculous statement because that would constitute certainly half of the Grecian Army, and I know where the Grecian Army was and it was not in eastern Greece. You will find just where the line of resistance of the British has been set up and you will find that it will be a switch line on high ground, organized in depth to protect the right and rear of the Greek position. Now I say this, even if the British should be driven out, that the most important thing they have done

is to insist that Germany has to fight for whatever she gets. (Applause.)

I think she was not only fine in doing that, but I think she was wise in doing it, because it has knocked the German time schedule askew. It means Germany has had to bring forces there that she could have well used in other places. If Germany begins to realize that now she has got to make this fight and the war is not going to be over by the Fall as she expects, there is going to be pressure in Germany dictated by the need of time, just as there is pressure in England to-day dictated by the need of ships.

So that takes us over to Africa itself. Now I was with these British Generals during the attacks on some of those places, and I always felt—and I told them so—that the British never got full credit for that effort because of their habit of self-deprecation, that they rather talk too easily about the Italians, but I think the fault there lay not in the Italian soldiers but in the Italian General. The whole system was worked out as a system of medieval isolated cities. The British looked upon the desert as their ally; the Italians thought it was an enemy. They were afraid of it, so they locked themselves up in the towns. That is why with so small a force England was able to take something over one hundred thousand prisoners. I think I saw eighty thousand of them myself in various degrees of being captured or of finally being deloused. (Amusement.)

Now you see that the German has come across the Straits. I remember when I first heard of them coming across. I was in Jugoslavia when they told me that that was the word. I heard that the Germans had a corps of motorized troops in Tripoli. Now it is really quite a military feat that they were able to go across the four hundred and ninety miles of desert between Tripoli and Bengazi.

Now there is a danger that the Germans will attempt a pincer movement, coming in through Turkey, and through the Suez. As I said to the gentlemen who came in with me to-day, the way to look at this thing is to see that what Germany is setting up is a group of options, any one of which or any combination of which she may exercise in

a given eventuality. So I think it is unwise for any one of us to have a pet project and say, Germany is going to do this. She will elect to do what seems wise and expedient at a given moment, but all of these options are part of one central plan in which she recognized that for a decisive victory she must down England.

I think we must not ignore this possibility either, that she could very well advance until she finds a hard spot in the desert, and hold; move against North Africa, because certainly she has been combing that situation, and filtering in German troops, attempt to reach Dakar from where she could tighten her grip on British shipping. That to me is the great danger which we may not fully realize to-day. The voyage from London to Suez, which is only four thousand miles now, may then become twenty thousand miles around the Cape, and five times as many ships would be required. So the great problem is how those ships are going to be protected in getting from America to England and to the Suez, and I hope we will have sense enough in our own interests as well as yours and England, to see that we do deliver the goods. (Applause.)

Now I have pointed out a lot of these dangers, Gentlemen, and I want to add to them this: I was with General McNaughton the night before I left. I was out on manoeuvres with the Canadian Troops and Tank Corps, and the Canadian Corps is certainly one of the great mobile reserves by which England intends to resist invasion. (Applause.) Certainly if Germany does attempt invasion now, the whole system of defence will be re-orientated. When I was there in July it was a question of meeting them at the ocean and trying to throw them back into the ocean. Now it is recognized that expeditions may be landed at any point and there will have to be mobile reserves maintained to stop and wipe up these expeditions.

All of that comes to this, Gentlemen. It means that this year is going to be a hard year; it is going to be a year when Germany is making her supreme effort. It is her inning now, and I don't want you to be misled by that

fact—you are going to have yours. There is a great danger that when the other team is in and hitting the ball, people do not remember that their team will have its inning. And I believe that there is a factor in this whole situation that we are apt to ignore and it is this, that while the German is a formidable and ruthless foe fighting not by the rules of cricket but fighting a bar-room fight, there are forces in the various countries as there are in your own, which recognize the moral vision that is behind your effort and recognize that you are not afraid to come to grips in this new kind of warfare. Even though the facts are against us now, I believe that the brain that created the machine can still lick the machine. (Applause.) Because so many of these articles of war that Germany has adapted, she has not created: they were set up as mediums of peace; she has adapted them as instruments of war.

I have come to this conclusion—if you are going to have a machine you have got to have the best machine; second best is no good: and if you can't have the best it is better to have none than second best. If you have second best you trust too much to it and you have a mobile Maginot Line. If you have none, you rely on your own brains, resourcefulness and courage. You will see before this war is over, that if a hundred-thousand dollar tank comes along, and you as a group have nothing but a gin bottle which you fill with coal-tar and nitroglycerine, if you have someone that has nerve enough to throw it, you blow the tank up. That takes a lot of courage, and I found wherever I have gone that that is the spirit of the people of Britain. (Applause.) And I for one would hate to be an invading soldier coming into England and being met by a Home Guard!

Now, Gentlemen, I know I have talked too long (No, No, from the audience) but I wanted to give you some of my impressions. This is going to be a damn tough year but I believe that next year if you can, if *we* people (applause) in North America can give hope and assurance to these people who are fighting on the front line, next year will be very different. (Prolonged applause.)

MR. C. R. SANDERSON: Colonel Donovan! When at the opening of your truly magnificent address you referred to our thirst for knowledge, you struck exactly the note that was uppermost in our minds in looking forward to your address. I was going to say, Sir, that in response to our anticipation you have given us reassurance. But you have given us something more important than that, because reassurance was not really the thing we needed. You have given us a renewed stimulation and you have given us a deeper understanding, an understanding of that wide sweep of strategy which, though we see it unfolding day by day before our eyes, is inexplicable except to and through someone like yourself, who as a world-intelligence officer has gathered information from first-hand and personal contacts in the theatres of war. We are grateful to you more than we can easily say, for having come to us and having talked so frankly and for having given us just that wider understanding that we needed.

May I add, too, that we have known about you for a long time. But we are happy to have listened to you in person; we are happy to have had this opportunity of feeling the force of your personality; and we are happy to seize this chance of expressing our recognition and appreciation of the vital contribution which you, Sir, are making to the cause which fundamentally is common to our two countries.

"SALUTE TO BRITAIN"

AN ADDRESS BY

HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL
J. M. RODRIGUE VILLENEUVE, O.M.I., D.D.,
D.D.C., D.Ph.

ARCHBISHOP OF QUEBEC.

A Joint Meeting of the Canadian Club and the Empire Club of Canada was held in the Royal York Hotel, on Thursday, April 17, 1941. The First Vice-President, Mr. C. R. Sanderson, presided.

MR. C. R. SANDERSON: Your Honour, Your Eminence, Distinguished Guests and Gentlemen of the Empire Club and Canadian Club. Before proceeding with our meeting I have three telegrams which I should like to read to you. The first is from the Honourable Adelard Godbout, addressed to the President of the Empire Club, and is as follows:

"Many thanks for your kind invitations to attend the luncheon of the Empire Club of Canada Thursday April 17th. Regret exceedingly impossible to leave Quebec owing to the sitting of our Legislature. Mr. Victor Doré, Superintendent of Public Instruction, will represent me. Please accept for yourself and the Directors of your Club and convey to His Eminence the expression of my deep regrets of being unable to be present. (Signed) Adelard Godbout."

The second is from Lt.-Col. D. B. Papineau, A.D.C. to the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Quebec.

"Your kind invitation received. The Lieutenant-Governor regrets inability to attend Empire Club Luncheon 17th. Please accept his most sincere thanks for thought-

fulness. He would have liked very much to have been with you. (Signed) D. P. Papineau, Lt.-Col., A.D.C."

The third telegram is from the Honourable G. Howard Ferguson, the President of the Empire Club, whose place I am taking to-day, and who says:

Victoria, B.C., April 16, 1941.

"H. C. Bourlier,
Secretary, the Empire Club.

Will be grateful if Chairman tomorrow's meeting will make my apologies to His Eminence the Cardinal and express sincere regret that I shall not have the honour of presiding at the luncheon and hearing an address which will be widely read and heard throughout Canada, and will, I am sure, be of great importance in promoting a genuine spirit of fellowship and unity of all Canadians, particularly at this critical time, so that we may as one people march forward in the cause of better citizenship and with a higher purpose in making the best use of the great opportunities with which our common country is blessed. (Signed) Howard Ferguson."

Gentlemen, many of us of recent days and weeks and months must have felt that this is almost an irreligious time, when the unleashed dogs of war are let loose over so vast an area of this globe, and when we are so conscious of the bestiality and brutality that war itself brings. It is almost an irreligious time. Yet, everyone who recalls his own experiences in the last war knows that in times of great duress, in times of what seemed to be the ultimate bearable physical strain, his thoughts went back to fundamental things—to the beauty of personal friendships, to the ties of home and family, and to that basic belief in eternity. And to-day it is good for us that His Eminence should come to us to remind us again that even in this time of stress these things are still with us.

At this moment, when the British Commonwealth of Nations is facing a terrific task, side by side with the British Commonwealth there stand a number of bands of free peoples whose nations are otherwise submerged. They have different languages, different backgrounds, but they

hold together in a common cause. They hold together because of common ideals and because of common understanding. And again, it is a good thing that at this moment His Eminence should come to us and talk about the common understanding which binds together two peoples, two races, two languages within the Federation of the Dominion of Canada.

Gentlemen, it is almost an impertinence to say anything to this audience about His Eminence. I say it only so that it may go in our official and printed archives. As a teacher, as a University Dean, he is rich in academic experience. How rich is shown by the fact that he has been honoured by six separate university doctorates.

On another side he comes to us as a Priest, as a Bishop, as an Archbishop, as a Cardinal. He is the one Canadian Member of the College of Cardinals, and is the Archbishop of that historic Diocese of Quebec. But, Gentlemen, he also comes as a Canadian. He comes as a Canadian, not in a provincial sense, but in a truly national sense in the widest possible interpretation of that word; he comes to-day to speak to us with the unified voice of the Roman Catholic Church throughout the Dominion of Canada.

Et maintenant, Votre Eminence, j'ai l'honneur de vous rendre mes hommages très sincères, en la langue de nos compatriotes du Canada français.

Je prends beaucoup de plaisir à vous présenter à cet assemblage composé de membres de ces deux sociétés célèbres.

Voulez-vous avoir la bonté de nous adresser la parole. (Applause.)

HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL VILLENEUVE, O.M.I., D.D.: Mr. President and Gentlemen: I could not desire a more acceptable expression of feeling in my regard than that which you have manifested by your enthusiastic and prolonged greeting.

It moves me deeply and brings to my mind the magnificent reception accorded to me by the Queen City, six

years ago, when I came here to receive, from the University of Toronto, the high honour of a Degree of Doctor of Laws, *honoris causa*, which that distinguished seat of learning conferred upon me. I was given a Civic Reception at the City Hall when the Mayor, Mr. Stewart, welcomed me in an address to which I endeavoured to give a fitting response.

The President of the University, my friend Dr. Cody, in an eloquent speech, presented me to the Chancellor, Sir William Mulock, and it was an additional honour and pleasure to receive the Doctor's cap and gown in the presence of the Grand Old Man of Canada.

I considered it a great compliment and an honour to be invited to address such a large and distinguished number of fellow Canadians, and willingly accepted your kind invitation.

Let me extend to you, Mr. President, my sincere thanks for your too flattering remarks, in my regard, in introducing me to this representative assembly, and assure you that I value them very highly. And I wish to express to the Officers of the Canadian Club my grateful feelings, for I must candidly confess that they were the ones who, through the medium of the Honourable Premier Godbout, made the first approaches, discreetly enquiring whether I would be willing to address the Canadian Club. This led to some correspondence from December last, and whether through some misunderstanding or was it providential, I know not, I answered Yes, but my answer went to the Empire Club. It was something like Isaac's blessing which he granted to Jacob, thinking this was Esau. I, like Isaac, when came the Empire Club's letter, was somewhat mystified: the voice indeed was from Toronto, but the Secretary was a new one to me. However thanks to the happy intervention of Archbishop McGuigan, who assumed the role of Rebecca on that occasion, and to the long political experience of my friend the Honourable Mr. Ferguson, I am the guest of the Empire Club. The truth is that my ingenuousness is responsible for the misunderstanding, and if I give my first blessing to the Empire Club, let the

Canadian rest assured that I am keeping another one to be granted to it on another occasion.

Gentlemen, the compliment you are paying me to-day, I regard as a token and significant symbol of Canadian unity, and a very happy means of promoting that good feeling and co-operation between the two great Provinces upon which national unity so much depends.

You recently had the advantage of hearing Premier Godbout voicing the feelings and ideals of my compatriots. May I quote what another Premier of Quebec, Mr. Taschereau, his predecessor, declared on a public occasion: "We, French Canadians, being the pioneers of Canada, rooted in our soil and traditions, identified with things Canadian for over three centuries, love every inch of this land, be it East or West, because we are the mother Province of Canada."

After such important declarations you would perhaps wish to know my views on our beloved country's future. May I repeat what I publicly said not very long ago. I was led to speak on the subject because there were rumours outside of the Province of Quebec, that the French Canadians, who composed the overwhelming majority of that Province were contemplating the establishment of a separate State in their Province, and the dominant influence of that separatist movement was the Catholic Church under the leadership of the Cardinal Archbishop of Quebec.

Not much notice was taken of this mischievous gossip in Quebec, no responsible person attached undue importance to it, but, unfortunately, it seemed to have aroused such suspicions in the minds of some English speaking Canadians, that I availed myself of a fitting occasion to put an end to such ridiculous rumours. Addressing a large Catholic and Protestant gathering, I said: "Never did I wish that the Province of Quebec should become either a clerical or fascist state. The Church in no way admits that patriotism should be love of isolation, that it should be confined to one village, town or province; no, it should extend to the whole of Canada and should be

accompanied by a vivid feeling of loyalty to our Sovereign, King George VI. But I for one believe that the more French Canadians will be themselves, with their proper spirit and ancestral traditions, the more they will nourish in their hearts deep and precious love for Canada. As to separation from the Empire or from Canada, we recall to every one that political evolution is illicit unless in accordance with acknowledged rights and constitutional order", and I added that "Divine Providence seems to have destined the English-speaking and French-speaking Canadians to co-operate in building a nation based upon Anglo-Saxon and French civilization."

It is generally admitted that the French Canadians are the most stable element in the Dominion. It is a notorious fact, whether it is due to their education or the influence of their religion, that they oppose a solid front against communism and other subversive doctrines.

It seems to me that, as Mr. Taschereau said, the French Canadians having been the pioneers of Canada, rooted in our soil and traditions for three centuries, they are true Canadians, and that they love every inch of this country of ours should entitle them to a more generous treatment on the part of some of their fellow Canadians. They are, as every one is aware, deeply attached to their language, religion and family and racial conditions, and resent any attempt to attack what they so dearly cherish.

In the Province of Quebec, the educational rights which the English minority enjoy, should be accepted as the basis for the extension of similar educational facilities to the French minority in other Provinces, and this would certainly contribute considerably to promote national unity.

Now, Gentlemen, no one more than I deploras the unhappy divisions which exist among those who believe in Christianity, and I have not the slightest wish to utter one word to provoke controversy or make such divisions wider, but I cannot refrain, when trying to promote national unity, to refer to the injurious and unpatriotic aspersions made by a certain clergyman against my race and creed. I know full well that they are not your feel-

ings, and so I consider that the best way to answer them is to ignore them altogether, especially after the recent admirable address of Colonel Foster to the Canadian Club at Quebec, and in which he stressed the vital importance of national unity. He spoke in excellent French and with such evident and soldierlike sincerity that his words carried conviction and have made a deep and lasting impression in his large and distinguished audience.

Let me suggest to you also, Gentlemen, to receive with some caution the words of a French Canadian journalist who appears to have no particular claim to speak for Quebec where he edits a weekly paper. He was quoted a few months ago by the author of an article on "Quebec classical Colleges" after the reading of which one is astounded at the gross inaccuracies which swarm all through that paper. I will only deal with the chief complaint against us of our discontented writer. He claims that the teaching in our classical Colleges and Universities is too religious and detrimental to other studies. We claim that our chief aim is to teach the whole truth, namely that which God has revealed and that which man has discovered, and to teach it not simply as an abstract theory, but as a practical guide and standard of action, as a law and indeed the supreme law of human conduct for individual, society and nation. Consequently higher education is precisely the field in which religion should be thoroughly cultivated and its practice most constantly fostered. If no regard is to be paid to religious truths, what will there be for the rights of a people? Is force to be the ultimate resort and final arbitration as we see it exemplified in Hitlerism?

I regret that the necessity of religion in education is not more widely shared by many peoples nowadays who regard religion as private luxury which should have no part in education. Such however is not the opinion of a well known English Statesman, Lord Halifax, who, while Minister of Education in the British Cabinet, made a very significant declaration. He stated that "it is more and more realized that religion is the essence and condition of character and a vital element in education and that the

training of character can only come from religion." We prefer to share such a noble Statesman and religious thinker's views as Lord Halifax's.

Now, in regard to certain suggestions which are put forward from time to time in different parts of the country, and that our French speaking population should be assimilated and that they should adopt the language and culture of the English speaking Canadian just like any other minority group. Referring to a somewhat noisy recent lecture on the matter, that suggestion is dealt with in an able article by Mr. Herbert T. Quinn, which appeared in the *Queen's Quarterly*, vol XLVII, No. 3 of 1940. "Those who advocate such a course," writes Mr. Quinn, "have but little knowledge of the French Canadian or of the terms under which the Province of Quebec agreed to combine with the other Provinces to form the Dominion of Canada. Furthermore I have no doubt that any attempt to assimilate French Canadians is not only doomed to failure but would mean the end of the Confederation."

I agree with Mr. Quinn when he declares that "the French Canadian is determined to maintain his language, his religion and his culture, even if it is necessary for the Province of Quebec to secede from the Dominion." And he adds that it is fear of losing his special heritage which at different times since 1867 gave rise to Quebec nationalism and its extreme form "separatism." I dealt with those questions a moment ago. "The separatist movement, however, is not likely to present any serious danger to Canadian unity, as long as the French Canadian," as Mr. Quinn writes, "has no reason to believe that the English speaking majority is trying to deprive him of his minority rights." May I however here remark that if in certain Provinces the French Canadians have good grounds for complaining in regard to their minority rights, nevertheless the people of Quebec realize the necessity and real benefits of the Confederation Pact and are willing and anxious to co-operate fully with the rest of the country, as long as the principle of equality between English and

French Canadian is upheld. They refuse, however, to be relegated to an inferior position within the Dominion.

Now, Gentlemen, I come to what is uppermost and ever in our minds: the War. May I first quote the prophetic words of the late Pius XI, who, foreseeing the awful dangers which threatened the world, appealed to all Christians to unite their forces against the powers of evil, enemies of God, no less than of mankind, for in this vital conflict the fundamental problem of the world is at stake. For God or against God is the terrible alternative which shall decide the destinies of mankind, and the Pope appealed to individuals and nations to put aside narrow individualism and base egotism, and unite to ward off the dreadful peril which threatened Christianity.

Alas! These prophetic words of the Pope were unheeded, one country after another fell into the hands of our formidable enemies, and to-day the British Empire and the United States are left almost alone to save Christian civilization and democracy. I feel I am giving expression to your thoughts in paying a just tribute to the indomitable spirit of the British people.

With enthusiasm have I agreed to patronize to salute Great Britain on St. George's day. The murderous air raids in England and Scotland have brought to light hidden heroism and have revealed courage unsurpassed in any conflict in the past. Their Majesties the King and Queen have set a magnificent example to their people by constantly sharing the dangers that beset them, and by their serenity and sympathy have inspired fresh courage in the hearts.

I wish also in your name and in my own to express the gratitude of those whose age, vocation or social condition cause them to benefit by the heroism of their fellow Canadians who have already gone or are preparing to go overseas, ready to lay down their lives to defend our righteous cause. Nor must we forget those who though desirous of going to the front, have been given the less glorious but necessary task of defending our coasts, or whose services could not be spared to permit them to enlist.

The magnificent example of courage set by the British people has been an inspiration to us and has stirred the patriotic spirit of every member of the nations in the British Empire.

The Commonwealth of Nations is not a mere concourse of people having among themselves relations more or less intimate of sole businesslike, of a community of material interests. It is much more than that, it is an association of free Nations united together, not compulsorily, but because they all share the substantially same ideals of social and international justice, honour and human dignity. And for that reason it has to be defended and safeguarded at all costs, even the cost of blood, under the leadership of those constitutionally presiding over its fortunes. So Canada entered freely, though efficaciously, into war.

There is far down within us all something deeper than personal interests, than personal kinships, than party feeling; it is the need and the will to be of service to our country and that will is rightly termed patriotism. The greatest thinkers of Rome and Greece, as Aristotle, the prince of antique philosophers, considered patriotism the highest of the natural virtues, and the religion of Christ exalts the pagan ideal and makes of patriotism a positive law. There is no perfect Christian who is not also a perfect patriot. In the light of this teaching, patriotism is seen in its religious character. Family interests, class interest, party interests and the material good of the individual take their place in the scale of values below the ideal of patriotism, for that ideal is Righteousness and Righteousness not only in personal but also in national matters and national honour. The violation of Righteousness whether enacted by an individual or by a nation must be publicly chastised. Men's minds are stirred up and tortured as long as the guilty party remains unpunished and outraged justice unavenged. No one can wish for peace without desiring that its destroyer shall be forced to yield to the unalterable edicts of justice and truth and pay the penalty for his crime.

Thus should this war be viewed to grasp fully the righteousness of our cause.

Ruthless might unhampered by recognition of plighted word and regardless of any law human or Divine has criminally invaded neutral countries and is inflicting on their defenceless populations a martyrdom the memory of which never wholly pass away and has perpetrated horrors which in their naked truth pass the bounds of credibility.

Unable to invade England as they did other countries, the forces of evil are attempting to shake the moral of the British people by a constant succession of violent air raids, dropping countless bombs on open towns and killing thousands of aged men, of women and children; but the tenacious endurance of the British remains unshaken and has won the profound admiration of the civilized world.

Now, Gentlemen, perhaps you will say: but how long will God allow these barbarians to inflict such suffering on humanity? The reply remains the secret of God. He is the Master of events and the sovereign Director of the human race.

I can easily understand how natural instinct rebels against such evils. The spontaneous thought of mankind is ever that virtue should have its instantaneous crown and injustice its penalty. But the ways of God are not our ways. The Scripture tells us that His ways are unsearchable. But His arm is not shortened, nor is He deaf to our prayers and, in the hour His Wisdom has established, His enemies shall be scattered and with the breath of His lips He shall slay the wicked.

We are fighting for ideals which are imponderable; ideals which cannot be measured, weighed and calculated, but are priceless. Righteousness, Honour, Peace, Freedom, ideals which cannot but be pleasing to God, and we may confidently leave their triumph in His Almighty Hands.

We and all lovers of morality and freedom are deeply grateful to the people of the United States for their powerful assistance in this vital conflict, the issue of which shall decide the fate of humanity for generations to come.

But, for victory, may I put the stress on prayer.

The power of prayer is very great. His Majesty the King has repeatedly invited us to implore the Divine assistance on our arms and to consecrate certain days to humble prayer and intercession to Almighty God on behalf of our cause. But do we earnestly respond to the King's appeal? do we pray in a penitential spirit acknowledging we have something to expiate with regard to our moral and religious standard? Are we making some sacrifices, and saving our money to help our Government to finance the war? Shall we continue to spend over \$200 million a year on drink?

I trust that the appeal of the Canadian Temperance Federation, urging abstinence from drink during the war, will receive a wise response.

The necessities of successful modern warfare brings the demand for efficiency home to each individual of the nation. In modern war it is not armies alone that fight, the whole nation is geared to a common effort. The man in the army and in the factory, in the business and on the farm, all are making a direct contribution to the strength and endurance of the nation. Efficiency is the demand of the hour and alcohol is the enemy of efficiency. I hope therefore that for the sake of our country and of the Empire all will fully realize that abstinence will powerfully aid us to win the war.

I fear, Gentlemen, that I am detaining you too long, but cannot refrain from drawing your attention to a very important matter, the German's work underground in the countries they want to conquer, including our own. They started their nefarious work long before war broke out, by establishing friendly contacts with people of every class and condition and carefully concealed the purpose of their friendly attitude. Their object was to make a close study of the different parties of their aims and mentality. The book, "*La Défense de l'Amérique*," by Mr. Chéradame, to which alluded recently Honourable Mr. Ernest Lapointe, Minister of Justice, could be read usefully. In bi-lingual countries, for instance, they will pose

as the friend of the race they wish to antagonize against the other and cleverly drive a wedge to keep the races apart by spreading false and acrimonious reports which may find their way in the press, and are calculated to embitter the relations between the two races and create bad feeling.

Let us do all we can to preserve our country against the danger of such fifth column propaganda.

Lastly, we may remember how, in our young days, our professors of history filled us with enthusiasm and admiration for Leonidas and the 300 Spartans who, instead of seeking safety in easy flight, allowed themselves to be crushed by the Persians' army at the pass of Thermopylae. The teachers of the Canadian generations of to-morrow will have other instances of military heroism and patriotism to evoke. And may we not hope that our generation, too, will preserve the memory of the union it has fashioned, and that in future there will be among us all a deeper wish for national unity, in a spirit of toleration and mutual good will.

As Canadians, deeply concerned with the happiness and welfare of our fellow men and with the future of our country, let us one and all, each in the sphere of his own activities, unite our efforts to promote our national unity, and let our efforts be accompanied by a deep feeling of loyalty to our Sovereign, King George VI, and to that world-wide Empire, of which we are proud and happy to form part.

I think I should terminate by the admirable prayer written by Admiral Nelson, on board of the "Victory", after having given the order that commenced the battle of Trafalgar, a hundred years ago, on Monday, October 21st, 1805.

"May the Great God, Whom I worship, grant to my Country, and for the benefit of Europe in general, a great and glorious Victory and may no misconduct in anyone tarnish it; and may humanity after Victory be the predominant feature in the British Fleet. For myself, individually, I commit my life to Him who made me, and may

His blessing light upon my endeavours for serving my country faithfully. To Him I resign myself and the just cause which is entrusted to me to defend. Amen. Amen. Amen." (Applause—prolonged.)

MR. A. R. COURTICE (President of the Canadian Club): Mr. Chairman, Your Honour, Your Eminence, Gentlemen: The significance of this meeting, as reflected by our head table guests, is very encouraging and inspiring. Following our meeting last December with Premier Godbout, and the return visit of Colonel Foster, already mentioned, who addressed in French an enthusiastic meeting of the Canadian Club at Quebec City, this meeting to-day is a fitting climax to a season of friendly and constructive inter-provincial exchanges between the leaders of Church, State and Army, at a time when conditions were never more favourable or the need so great for racial and religious tolerance and co-operation in the interests of a great and a united Canada within the Empire, and loyalty to the Crown. (Applause.)

It is in that spirit that His Eminence has so graciously accepted our invitation to come to Toronto. In that spirit that he has spoken to us to-day, and in that spirit that we have received him so enthusiastically. I am sure we have all been moved by his "Salute To Britain," and the salute from the Prince and leader of Canada's four and one-half million Roman Catholics. Your Eminence, may I assure you that we deeply appreciate the honour and the significance of your visit to us, and on behalf of this joint meeting of the Empire and Canadian Clubs, may I thank you most sincerely for your splendid gesture of good will and for your address to us to-day. (Applause.)

"MUNITIONS AND MORE MUNITIONS"

AN ADDRESS BY

THE HONOURABLE C. D. HOWE, B. Sc., M.E.I.C.

MINISTER OF MUNITIONS AND SUPPLY.

Chairman: The Third Vice-President, Mr. E. F.
Thompson.

Thursday, April 24, 1941

MR. E. F. THOMPSON: Gentlemen of the Empire Club and our Unseen Audience of the Air: To-day we are to have the pleasure of hearing an address from one of Canada's leading citizens. (Applause.) Although of American birth he became a citizen of Canada in 1908 and is now serving in the Federal Cabinet. Born in Massachusetts and educated as a civil engineer, a graduate of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and the holder of the Degree of Bachelor of Science, he came to Canada thirty-three years ago to assume the rôle of Professor of Engineering at Dalhousie University, that University which has given so many men to Canadian public life. Later he was Chief Engineer for the Board of Grain Commissioners at Fort William. He was first elected to the House of Commons in 1935 and was at once taken into the Cabinet as Minister of Railways and Minister of Marine. These portfolios were later combined as the Ministry of Transport. As Minister of Transport he became prominently identified with the early development of Trans-Canada Air Lines. This, coupled with his engineering and business experience, gives him an exceptional grasp of war programmes in which air training and air equipment play so important a part. His parliamentary experience has been shorter than that of many of his

colleagues but he has proven a great strength to the Administration. He is one of the most able and one of the most indefatigable of Ottawa Ministers.

It is my privilege to present to you the Minister of Munitions and Supply—The Honourable Clarence D. Howe. (Applause.)

THE HONOURABLE C. D. HOWE, B.Sc., M.E.I.C.: Mr. Chairman, Honoured Guests and Gentlemen: It is my purpose at this time to discuss developments in Canada's munitions programme in its endeavour to meet the changing needs of warfare. I appreciate the fact that to most people the production of munitions is a prosaic business. Nevertheless I have been thinking of little else for the last eighteen months and, therefore, find it difficult to speak on any other subject. To me the production of munitions of war is the most important job in the world and I hope that my fellow-Canadians can have some appreciation of the magnitude of the task that we are attempting in that regard.

After more than eighteen months of war we find three great battles in progress—the Battle of the Mediterranean, the Battle of England and the Battle of the North Atlantic. So far as the defence of Britain is concerned, the first named is the least important. We have seen Egypt attacked by the Italian armies of Libya; we have seen these armies driven back into Libya and practically destroyed. We now have the Italian army replaced by a well equipped German army, while great numbers of our own troops have moved from North Africa to Greece. The call to aid the gallant armies of Greece came late in the day, but nevertheless effective aid has been given. German successes in that area have been at tremendous cost of men and munitions. The British, Australian and New Zealand troops in that area are performing miracles in holding back enemy forces greatly superior in numbers and in armament. British troops and supplies destined for the Mediterranean must take the long route along South Africa and through the Red Sea, while Germany has an

overland supply line. Whatever the outcome, the Greeks will know that England has not failed them in their hour of need. I say that this is the least important of the three battles, for defeat in the Mediterranean would not mean the loss of the Battle of Britain.

The Battle of England is still confined to aerial attacks, coming with increased frequency and severity. The British Air Force have stopped day bombing, but the defence against night bombing has not as yet been perfected. This is not a war against British troops, but rather against the British civilian population—men, women and children. I have had some small personal experience with this type of warfare. I recall the last Sunday evening of 1940, when London experienced one of its heaviest bombing raids, and perhaps the greatest loss of property, through incendiary bombs. The air-raid signal came at about a quarter past six and about half-past six a bomb struck immediately back of my hotel, cutting off the lights and water in the hotel and wrecking the Egyptian Embassy across the street. The guests at the hotel assembled in the lobby and, as candles were lighted, conversations were resumed where they had been interrupted. I had an engagement that evening to dine in Grosvenor Square and about half-past seven I left the hotel for my destination—a walk of about twenty minutes—through the blackout, accompanied by my oldest boy, who is serving in the British Navy, both of us wearing steel helmets as a protection against shrapnel.

I think I will always remember that twenty minute walk. Two or three times we found streets closed by newly-opened bomb craters and had to detour. Bombs fell almost continuously, some near and some farther away. Occasionally we would hear the patter of falling shrapnel from our own anti-aircraft guns in Hyde Park. We reached our destination without incident, and I can tell you that I, for one, was very glad to find a roof over my head. After dinner, we walked back to our hotel. By this time the raid was pretty well over. The fires in the vicinity of St. Paul's Cathedral made the streets as light

as day. After we got back to our hotel we climbed to the roof to see the fires. I never expect to see a more terrifying or a more spectacular sight. There were fires in all directions and it looked as though all London must be burning. But by next morning, a large part of London was doing business as usual.

To-day, when I read of a heavy air-raid in London, I think of that evening, which was the worst of many similar evenings that I experienced during my month's stay in London. I think of the thousands of men and women who were out that evening, some as fire watchers, some as drivers of ambulances and food-waggon, and some serving as firemen or members of bomb-disposal squads. That is the Battle of England as it is to-day. To-morrow it may have the added horrors of an attempted invasion. If that comes, Canadian troops will be in the key positions. They will be trained to the minute, well armed and certain to give a good account of themselves. Loss of the Battle of England means the loss of the war, and much as our troops envy the Australians and New Zealanders their active fighting, they realize the importance of their own post.

I am certain that the Battle of England will not be lost. England to-day is an armed camp. Every open space that could be used as a landing place for aeroplanes has been trenched and filled with obstacles. Broad highways have obstruction wires overhead and tank traps at frequent intervals. Men of the civilian population have been armed with rifles and trained as Home Guard units. Seasoned troops, well trained and well equipped, are located at all strategic points. Britain's aerodromes are manned with fighting units for defence and bombing units to carry destruction into enemy territory. Britain's defensive and offensive strength in the air is growing daily as new aeroplanes are turned out by her factories and received from North America. Bombing has had surprisingly little effect in slowing down the production of aeroplanes and munitions in Britain. It must have been a surprise to Hitler that bombing so far has had the effect

of increasing the determination of the British people to fight on until victory comes. (Applause.)

The United States has sent many skilled observers to Britain in the last several months and all of them have brought back the report that Britain will win the war. I believe that all of them have based their opinion on the character of the British people and their ability to stand up under punishment. At the moment, Germany has the preponderant strength in numbers of troops and armament, but Britain is strong in the character of her population.

Now, we come to the third battle, the Battle of the North Atlantic, which has broken out with renewed fury since the beginning of this year. During the past winter every shipyard in Germany and in the occupied countries has been occupied in building submarines and these are now loose on the North Atlantic. Every armed vessel possessed by Germany and her Allies is being used as a surface raider. Dive bombers are attacking our ships almost half way across the Atlantic. Losses to Britain's merchant shipping have been severe, in spite of the magnificent work of the British Navy. We must remember that, since the outbreak of war, Britain's Navy has been called upon to do the work that was taken care of by four Allied navies in the last war, in protecting Britain's shipping lanes in all parts of the world. To date that Navy has won its every battle and has maintained its mastery of the Seven Seas, but adequate protection for all allied shipping has been beyond the possibilities. Britain's shipyards have been working to full capacity, building naval and merchant ships, but nevertheless losses have greatly exceeded new construction. Recently the shipbuilding capacity of the United States has been added to that of Britain and her Allies, with the result that by next Spring, new construction will greatly exceed the present rate of loss, but throughout the next few months the Battle of the North Atlantic promises to be the crucial one for Britain.

Canada's munitions programme has been varied from

time to time to meet the present needs of Britain as they have appeared. From the outset it has been evident that convoy vessels would be needed and we lost no time in starting a programme designed to build convoy ships in considerable numbers. We have completed or are now building one hundred and ten corvettes, which are small destroyers very suitable for anti-submarine warfare. We have built or are building some sixty steel mine-sweepers, and we have built or are building a large fleet of smaller boats, some of steel and some of timber.

Recently, when the losses of merchant shipping began to mount rapidly, we turned our shipbuilding capacity over to the construction of ten thousand ton freighters. Every yard capable of building this type of boat now has work under way and we are developing an "all out" programme for building merchant ships in all parts of Canada. This work has been placed in the hands of a Government-owned corporation with the name of Wartime Merchant Shipping Limited, under the presidency of Mr. H. R. MacMillan. A standard design has been adopted and the construction of hulls, boilers, engines and fittings is being undertaken on a quantity production basis. To date contracts have been placed for twenty-six merchant ships, and it is expected that within the next month this number will have been trebled. At the beginning of the war Canada's shipbuilding industry employed about fifteen thousand men. To-day the number stands at more than twenty-two thousand, and our purpose will be to expand these numbers as rapidly as possible.

For the future, our policy will be to confine our construction programme of corvettes, mine-sweepers and smaller navel vessels to shipyards on the Great Lakes, and to use shipyards on the St. Lawrence River and on both oceans for the construction of merchant ships. Many additional building berths are being constructed at existing shipyards. In order to avoid disorganizing existing yards, the creation of new shipyards will not be undertaken until the personnel of existing yards can be brought up to full requirements.

Until recently it has been the practice of Great Britain to make only temporary repairs on this side of the Atlantic and to do permanent repair work in England. The bombing situation has made it desirable to reverse this policy, with the result that our present repair facilities are proving inadequate. Extensive additional facilities are under construction and by autumn we expect to be able to handle all repair work promptly. We fully appreciate the fact that the quickest way to provide shipping for Britain is to avoid delays to ships in Canadian ports. To reduce the time required for loading, an extensive lighterage system is being built to supplement dockage capacity of our Eastern maritime ports and this will be in operation at the close of the St. Lawrence River season. The concentration of labour at our Eastern ports has created a serious housing shortage and this is being met by the construction of new buildings. We are also building rest and recreational facilities for merchant seamen and are undertaking extensive training courses designed to provide skilled seamen to man the ships now being built.

At the outset of the war, Canada undertook a large programme for building shells, small arms, ammunition and explosives which were her main contribution of munitions in the last war. All these shell plants are now in full production. Now plants for the manufacture of small arms ammunition have been completed and the work of training new personnel is being followed up intensively. Three very large explosives plants have been built, and two of those are now in full production. Four shell-filling projects are under construction, and one has been completed and placed in operation. Huge chemical plants have been built to supply raw material for ammunition, and in the main those are in full operation. Canada's ammunition programme is nearing completion on a scale far larger than in the last war.

Canada has a strong motor industry, and no time was lost in tooling up this industry for the production of motor transport vehicles which are so essential in modern warfare. You are all familiar with the fact that the motor

vehicles used in the Egyptian campaign were manufactured in Canada as were the motor transport vehicles for our troops in England and in Canada. Canada has sent motor vehicles to every country in the British Empire and orders are in hand to keep this industry fully occupied until the end of the current year. The motor industry is also producing the Universal Carrier, which is now being manufactured in considerable volume for our own troops and for Britain. We have developed a light high-speed tank, which we will call on the motor industry to produce as soon as opportunity offers. I am happy to say that our motor industry has lived up to every promise that it has made.

Since Dunkerque the call has been for guns and heavy tanks. The manufacture of guns accounts for about one-third of our capital investment in new plants, which now reaches \$400,000,000. We have undertaken the manufacture of almost every type of gun used in this war from Lee Enfield rifles up to 6-inch naval guns and 3.7 anti-aircraft guns. This has been a business new to Canada, but by calling on our strongest industrial firms we are making a creditable showing. New gun plants are now coming into production from week to week and, by mid-summer, guns will represent our largest munitions export. We were particularly fortunate to have undertaken the production of Bren guns prior to the outbreak of war, and these are moving across the ocean in large volume.

The production of heavy tanks has presented many problems. It has been necessary to develop the production of armour plate and many components new to Canadian industry. Two types of heavy tanks are in production—the heavy infantry tanks and cruiser tanks. I am happy to say that our design and production problems have now been solved. Within the next month the infantry tank will also be in volume production. In my opinion these tanks have represented the greatest challenge to Canadian industry of any type of war munition.

In the matter of aeroplanes, we started from very small beginnings. Our primary job has been to meet the

requirements of our great Air Training Programme and this we have been able to do. At the same time we have made a substantial contribution to Britain's fleet of fighting planes. At present we are turning out about forty-five planes per week, of which about 40 per cent are fighter planes and 60 per cent trainer planes. The types of these planes run from primary trainers to advanced trainers, to fast fighters, to heavy bombers and flying boats. The personnel of the industry has expanded from one thousand men pre-war, to some twenty-two thousand at present, and is growing rapidly. We have recently undertaken the manufacture of a fast American-type bomber and the latest type of long-range flying boat. Our Air Training Programme involves a large maintenance and overhaul programme which is now well organized and equipped.

In expanding our programme of finished munitions it has been necessary to greatly enlarge our production of primary products such as steel, aluminum and chemicals, and many millions of dollars have been expended in that direction. The result is that we are self-contained for most of the components and raw products of our munitions programme.

The growing importance of secret radio devices as a means of defence has led us to establish a plant in the vicinity of Toronto for the manufacture of these devices, as well as optical glass for the manufacture of gun-sights and binoculars. This plant is just now coming into production. It is one of the most spectacular of our munitions projects, and orders are pouring in from Britain and from other countries. A number of British manufacturers have co-operated in developing the processes being developed here, and I believe that the plant, when in full operation, will be unique in the British Empire.

I sometimes think that my work of organizing war production in Canada is the most discouraging of jobs. My days are spent in a battle against time. Munitions are needed on the day the order is placed, but it takes from eighteen months to two years to bring into production a

gun plant for field guns, anti-aircraft guns and naval guns; anywhere from a year to eighteen months to bring into production a plant for rifles and automatic guns. It takes about fifteen months to bring a new bomber plane into production, and from nine months to a year to develop a new type of trainer aircraft. The battle for machine tools never ends. The production of machine tools in Canada was seven times as great in 1940 as in 1939 and will be fifteen times as great in 1941 as in 1939, but even then we must import about 90 per cent of our tools. I am too busy to think of production that is going well; I am too occupied in trying to find a solution for bottlenecks. That this situation is not peculiar to Canada was indicated by Mr. Churchill in his remarks in the British House of Commons a short time ago. Here are his words:

"It is not possible to make a warship go to sea and fight against the enemy, until fires have been lighted, and the water in the boilers changed from cold to tepid, to warm, to hot. Then steam is generated and the vast power is given. While this is going on, there is no use rushing about uttering alarming cries."

However, I occasionally find time to visit a war industry that is in full production, and in doing so I feel a good deal of compensation for the troubles of the week.

There are a great many war plants in production that will repay a visit. One of the most spectacular is the aluminum plant at Arvida, which has been expanded three-fold since the war began and which makes about one-half of all the aluminum produced on this continent and more than one-quarter of all the aluminum produced in the world. Associated with it are the new plants at Kingston, producing aluminum sheets, rods, extruded shapes and forgings. Here in Toronto we have an automatic gun plant which, when brought up to full production, will be the largest plant of its kind in the world. The explosive plants at Nobel and de Salaberry Island, now in full production, are a spectacular size, and the shell-loading plant at St. Paul l'Ermite is also a tremendous operation. Some

fifteen chemical plants are manufacturing raw materials for explosives, and one at Niagara Falls, built at a cost of \$20,000,000, is unique in that it produces a product never before manufactured in volume. At Fort William we have an aeroplane plant employing fifty-seven hundred men and women, which turns out fifteen Hurricane planes each week.

One interesting project is the Government Arsenal at Quebec, which has been expanded greatly for the production of small arms ammunition. This plant is operated by civil servants. Employment before the war was five hundred and sixty-five. At present, thirty-seven hundred persons are employed, and ultimately employment will reach eighty-five hundred persons. When the war broke out this plant was producing less than two hundred thousand rounds of ammunition per week. It now turns out over thirty-five hundred thousand rounds per week and will ultimately make fourteen million rounds per week. The most pleasing feature is the quality of its product. The highest grade ammunition is marked with a red label as suitable for aircraft guns, and about 90 per cent of all ammunition from this plant is red label as against about 40 per cent for other similar plants. I am told that aircraft gunners in England ask for Canadian ammunition whenever it is available. I recently saw a letter from the head of the British Procurement Division for Small Arms Ammunition, who wrote our manager to say that he had seen every arsenal in the world and considered this plant the most efficient that he had ever visited.

I often wonder why some of my fellow-citizens seem to take pleasure in belittling Canada's effort in the production of war munitions. I spent part of last week in Washington and while there I had a talk with an official of the United States Government. He was loud in his praise of the magnificent contribution that Australia is making to the war of Britain. I agreed with him wholly and from the bottom of my heart. Later on I suggested that Canada was also making a considerable contribution. He seemed rather surprised and stated that he had been

led to believe that Canada's contribution was far from "all out". I told him something of our effort and as the story developed he expressed amazement. Finally, he said that he had been told by Canadians that Canada was not doing what it could do in the war, and that he found it hard to realize that what I was telling him could be true.

None of us will be disposed to belittle the effort of Australia, or to doubt that it is a "full out" effort. I could, however, call your attention to a recent statement by Premier Menzies that, in the current fiscal year, Australia would produce munitions to the value of \$100,000,000, and at the same time remind you that we estimate the value of Canada's production of munitions in the same period at \$1,500,000,000, or fifteen times as great.

Measured in dollars, we have set ourselves a gigantic task. The cost of Canada's war effort in the current fiscal year is estimated at about \$1,500,000,000, and in addition we must find about \$1,100,000,000 to finance purchases of Great Britain in Canada. I hope those who delight in belittling Canada's war effort will take equal delight in belittling their own tax bills.

A mighty factor in the war of Britain is the support of the United States in the production of ships and munitions of war for Britain and her Allies. Whereas the United States, in relation to Canada, has a population of some eleven to one, its national income is as \$80,000,000,000 to our \$5,000,000,000 per year, and its production of finished steel products, an important index, is eighty million tons per year as against our three million tons per year. There is no doubt that our great neighbour is placing herself on a war footing as rapidly as possible. Her contribution of aeroplanes and other supplies is already an important factor in the war, and these contributions will grow in geometrical proportions as the months go by.

The agreement recently announced by Mr. Roosevelt and Prime Minister King from Hyde Park, which provides for use of the productive facilities of both countries to best advantage by an exchange of products that each is

best suited to produce, is of the highest importance to our munitions programme. We believe that Canada can finance all that can be produced in Canada, but we share with Britain the difficulty of finding American dollars to purchase components that can be manufactured much more economically in the United States. On the other hand, we have a problem in arranging for continuous production for our munitions plants built to supply munitions for which the requirement is urgent but limited as to quantity. It is expected that the agreement recently announced will go far toward enabling us to pay our debts in the United States with munitions for which we have a surplus capacity from time to time, and at the same time iron out peaks and valleys of war demand. United States is lease-lending ships, munitions and supplies to Britain. The agreement provides that this arrangement will be extended to United States components of British munitions manufactured in Canada. While United States has authority to lease-lend to Canada, we hope that the new agreement will avoid the necessity for our obtaining goods for our own use by resorting to the lease-lend arrangement.

I fully believe that Canada is making an "all out" war effort. I know that our people will be satisfied with nothing else. I hope that Canadian workmen can be found to man the productive capacity which is being created. Somehow or other men and women must be found for that purpose, even if domestic production is seriously curtailed. I find the greatest encouragement in the way in which Canadian Industry and Canadian Labour are both putting their backs behind war production. Canada is a united country, and united in its determination to win this war. The road may be long, but victory rests at its end.

My recent visit to Britain has given me some appreciation of the debt we owe to those men and women who live and walk in danger, eat scanty meals and yet are strong in their determination to fight the war to its bitter end. They find leadership and inspiration in the towering figure of Winston Churchill, who has the power to put into living

words the battle cry that is in the hearts of all. I have seen something of the hardships of the British merchant seamen in their battles with submarines and dive bombers. I have heard first-hand accounts of the exploits of our Navies and Air Force, and I have seen the precautions taken in the protection of Britain against invasion. If every Canadian, man and woman, could cross the Atlantic and spend a month in England, no words of mine would be needed to urge the utmost efforts of all of us to rush the last ounce of aid to those gallant men and women in their hour of need. (Applause—prolonged.)

MR. C. R. SANDERSON: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: I think we were all conscious before that the portfolio of the Minister of Munitions and Supply was a twenty-four hour job. We are more convinced of that than ever. And, Sir, we know you must have come at personal sacrifice, because your job does not wait, it still has to be done when you get back from having taken these hours out of an already over-full day. But at the same time when every one of us is holding his breath with anxiety as to what the next newspaper headline will be, it is a good thing that you will take time to come and tell us the progress that is being made in this vital job which you have undertaken. And the Dominion is fortunate in having a man holding your portfolio who is an engineer and who has personally experienced what warfare means both on sea and on land. And when to that background there is added the ability, the energy, the personal drive that you put into this vital task, to-day, Sir, gives us one more opportunity of re-expressing our personal appreciation and our confidence in the vital task which you are carrying on. (Applause.)

MR. E. F. THOMPSON: Gentlemen, thank you, Mr. Sanderson, and through you, the Honourable Mr. Howe. The meeting is now adjourned.

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

Chairman: The Third Vice-President, Mr. E. F.
Thompson.

Thursday, April 24, 1941

MR. E. F. THOMPSON: I have explained to our guest-speaker that prior to our going on the air it is necessary for us to dispense with a little business, known as our Annual Meeting. I have assured him that it will be short and to the point as we do not want to encroach upon his time.

Our President, the Honourable G. Howard Ferguson, is still in Western Canada and in his absence I have been asked to act as Chairman for the day. At this point I would like to read a wire that has been received by our Honorary Secretary from our President:

"Will be grateful if Chairman, Empire Club meeting tomorrow will make my apologies and express my disappointment to Hon. Mr. Howe that I shall not have the honour of presiding at the meeting and hearing his address which, at this critical time, will be of widespread interest and doubtless be of great value in removing confusion in the public mind and clarifying the position of our war effort, so that we will be assured of complete unity of all Canadians in a maximum contribution to the vital cause the Empire is straining every resource to uphold for all of us.

HOWARD FERGUSON."

In reporting on the year's activities I am able to say that our financial position is sound and that during the year the Club was able to make a donation of \$500 to the British War Victims' Fund. There have been the usual

changes in the Club membership, but particularly in view of the abnormal times, I am sure that you will be pleased to learn that our total to-day is exactly that of a year ago, there being one thousand and twenty-eight members. These figures include twenty-four honorary memberships on account of war service.

We have felt deeply the loss of fifteen members by death, two Life Members—the late John MacKay and Archbishop Sweeney. The others who passed away were: Lawrence H. Baldwin, Thomas I. Hollinrake, Charles A. Jefferis, M. W. McGillivray, S. W. McKeown, John A. Pearson, Campbell Reaves, H. T. Routly, T. A. Russell, J. W. Spears, W. D. Taylor, B. A. Twiss, Thomas A. Welch.

Thirty-three meetings were held during the 1940-41 season. Ten of these were joint with the Canadian Club. Your Executive has tried to secure for you the outstanding men of the day, and during the past year we have been favoured with addresses from such leading personalities as: The Earl of Athlone, Air Marshal Bishop, The Crown Prince of Norway, Honourable C. D. Howe, Honourable J. A. Godbout, Dr. John R. Mott, Colonel W. J. Donovan and Cardinal Villeneuve.

The customary year book containing all the addresses is in the course of preparation and will be distributed in due time to the members.

Mr. Ferguson would, I am sure, want me at this time to express the Club's most sincere thanks to our Honorary Secretary-Treasurer, Mr. Harry Bourlier, for the splendid work he has accomplished on our behalf during the year. (Applause.)

At this juncture I will call upon the Chairman of the Nominating Committee, Dr. Gaby, to read the report of that Committee.

DR. F. A. GABY: The Nominating Committee appointed by the Executive of the Empire Club of Canada on March 13, 1941, to propose the President, Executive Officers and Honorary Secretary-Treasurer for the year

1941-42, met on March 31, 1941, and as Chairman of the Committee I beg to present the following report of their recommendations :

President	—Mr. C. R. Sanderson
1st Vice-President	—Mr. E. F. Thompson
2nd “ “	—Mr. W. Eason Humphreys
3rd “ “	—Mr. Hector Charlesworth
Honorary Secretary-Treasurer	—Mr. H. C. Bourlier
Honorary Auditor	—Mr. H. T. Jamieson
Assistant Treasurer	—Mr. W. W. Comber

Executive Committee (17 members as required by the Constitution) :

New

Dr. F. A. Gaby
 Mr. Sigmund Samuel, LL.D.
 Mr. Tracy Lloyd
 Mr. Charles Conquergood

Former

Mr. H. H. Bishop
 Mr. F. L. Clouse
 Mr. F. B. Fetherstonhaugh, K.C.
 Mr. Horace Harpham
 Mr. A. T. Hunt
 Mr. J. C. M. MacBeth, K.C.
 Mr. F. Hedley Marsh
 Mr. Leonard L. McMurray
 Mr. J. P. Pratt, K.C.
 Mr. Frank Pullen
 Mr. A. Ross Robertson
 Mr. J. D. Spence, K.C.
 Mr. R. A. Stapells.

Immediate Past President
 Hon. G. Howard Ferguson, K.C.

According to the Constitution, the following Past Presidents are appointed to the Executive Committee:

Mr. Wm. Brooks (1924)

Rev. R. N. Burns, D.D. (1925)

Col. A. E. Kirkpatrick, V.D. (1926)

MR. E. F. THOMPSON: Gentlemen, you have heard the report of the Nominating Committee. Does anyone care to make any motion?

It was moved by Dr. H. L. Brittain,

Seconded by Mr. John Maxwell,

THAT the Report of the Nominating Committee be received and adopted. And that the warmest appreciation of the Club be tendered to our retiring President, the Hon. G. Howard Ferguson, for his outstanding services during the past year.

CARRIED.

MR. E. F. THOMPSON: I will now ask the incoming President to take the seat on my left. I am sure you would like to hear a few words from Mr. Sanderson. (Applause.)

MR. C. R. SANDERSON: Mr. Chairman: This is a great honour that you have done to me, but it is also a great responsibility at this moment for any man to be elected to the Presidency of the Empire Club of Canada. I am grateful for the confidence that is shown in me. I enter the office with humility and I promise the Club there shall be nothing lacking in my efforts to make the coming year as successful a year as the Club has seen in the past. (Applause.)

MR. E. F. THOMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Sanderson.

THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA, TORONTO, ONTARIO

THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT RECEIPTS AND PAYMENTS FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30th APRIL, 1941

Cash on Hand and in Bank as at 30th
April, 1940 \$ 1,841.31

RECEIPTS

Membership Fees\$ 4,014.00

Interest:

On Investment\$ 32.50

On Savings Account 36.56

69.06

Sale of Year Book 11.00

\$4,094.06

PAYMENTS

Luncheon Expenses\$ 6,979.40

Less:

Sale of Tickets:

By outside

Agencies\$6,032.00

By Honorary

Secretary-

Treasurer 413.00 \$6,445.00 \$ 534.40

Printing, Postage and Stationery.....\$2,135.61

Recording and Publicity 560.21

Salary of Assistant Treasurer 199.99

Speakers Fees and Expenses 343.97

Miscellaneous Expenses 54.86

Donation to British War Victims

Fund 500.00

Telephone and Telegraph 262.99

\$4,592.03

Excess of Payments over Receipts\$ 497.97

Cash on Hand and in Bank as at 30th April, 1941\$ 1,343.34

We report that we have examined the books and accounts of The Empire Club of Canada, Toronto, Ontario, for the year ended 30th April, 1941; that we have obtained all the information and explanations we have required and that, in our opinion, the above statement of Receipts and Payments is properly drawn up so as to exhibit a true and correct view of the transactions of the Club according to the best of our information and the explanations given to us and as shown by the books of the Club for the year ended 30th April, 1941.

H. T. JAMIESON & COMPANY,

Toronto, Ontario,
30th May, 1941.

Chartered Accountants,
Honorary Auditors.

EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

PAST HONORARY PRESIDENTS:

- *1903-1912 Rt. Hon. Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal,
G.C.M.G., LL.D., D.C.L.
- 1913-1926 Field Marshal H.R.H. The Duke of Connaught and
Strathearn, K.G., G.C.M.G.
- 1927-1931 Rt. Hon. Viscount Willingdon, G.C.S.I., G.C.M.G.
- 1931-1935 Rt. Hon. The Earl of Bessborough, P.G., G.C.M.G.
- *1935-1940 Rt. Hon. Lord Tweedsmuir, G.C.M.G., C.H.

PAST PRESIDENTS:

- *1902-05 Brig.-Gen. James Mason
- *1905-06 Rev. William Clark, D.D., LL.D., D.C.L.
- *1906-07 J. P. Murray, Esq.
- 1907-08 J. F. M. Stewart, Esq., B.A.
- *1908-09 D. J. Goggins, Esq., M.A., D.C.L.
- 1909-10 Elias Clouse Esq., M.D.
- *1910-11 J. Castell Hopkins, Esq., F.S.S.
- 1911-12 F. B. Fetherstonhaugh, Esq., K.C.
- 1912-13 Rt. Rev. James F. Sweeney, M.A., D.D., D.C.L.
- *1913-14 Mr. Justice James Craig
- *1914-15 Lt.-Col. R. J. Stuart
- *1915-16 Albert Ham, Esq., Musc. Doc.
- *1916-17 James Black Perry, Esq.
- 1917-18 Norman Sommerville, Esq., M.A., K.C.
- 1918 F. J. Coombs, Esq.
- 1919 R. A. Stapells, Esq.
- *1920 Arthur Hewitt, Esq.
- 1921 Brig.Gen. C. H. Mitchell, C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O., LL.D.
- 1922 Sir William Hearst, K.C.M.G., K.C., LL.D.
- 1923 Ellis H. Wilkinson, Esq.
- 1924 William Brooks, Esq.
- 1925 Rev. R. N. Burns, D.D.
- 1926 Col. A. E. Kirkpatrick, Hon. A.D.C.
- *1927 Col. Alexander Fraser, LL.D., A.D.C.
- 1928 Robert H. Fennell, Esq.
- *1929 Hugh S. Eayrs, Esq.
- 1930 John D. Spence, Esq., K.C.
- 1931 H. G. Stapells, Esq.
- 1932-34 Lt.-Col. Geo. A. Drew, V.D., A.D.C.
- 1933-34 Major W. Jas. Baxter, M.C.
- 1934-35 Dana H. Porter, Esq.
- 1935-36 J. H. Brace, Esq.
- 1936-37 Major G. B. Balfour
- 1937-38 R. M. Harcourt, Esq.
- 1938-39 J. P. Pratt, Esq., K.C.
- 1939-40 F. A. Gaby, Esq., B.A.Sc., D.Sc.
- * Deceased

EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

Officers:

YEAR 1941-1942

President: C. R. SANDERSON, ESQ., M.A., B.Sc.

First Vice-President: E. F. THOMPSON, ESQ.

Second Vice-President: W. EASON HUMPHREYS, ESQ.

Third Vice-President: HECTOR CHARLESWORTH, ESQ.

Honorary Secretary-Treasurer: H. C. BOURLIER, ESQ.

Assistant Treasurer: W. W. COMBER, ESQ.

Honorary Auditor: H. T. JAMIESON, ESQ.

Executive Committee:

H. H. BISHOP, ESQ.

F. L. CLOUSE, ESQ.

CHAS. R. CONQUERGOD, ESQ.

F. B. FETHERSTONHAUGH, ESQ., K.C.

F. A. GABY, ESQ., B.A.Sc., D.Sc.

HORACE HARPHAM, ESQ.

A. T. HUNT, ESQ.

TRACY LLOYD, ESQ.

J. C. M. MACBETH, ESQ., K.C.

F. HEDLEY MARSH, ESQ.

LEONARD L. McMURRAY, ESQ.

J. P. PRATT, ESQ., K.C.

FRANK PULLEN, ESQ.

A. ROSS ROBERTSON, ESQ.

SIGMUND SAMUEL, ESQ., LL.D.

J. D. SPENCE, ESQ., K.C.

R. A. STAPELLS, ESQ.

Immediate Past President:

HON. G. HOWARD FERGUSON, P.C. (Can.) K.C.

Past Presidents:

WILLIAM BROOKS, ESQ.

REV. R. N. BURNS, D.D.

COL. A. E. KIRKPATRICK, V.D.

CONSTITUTION

INSTITUTED 1903

THE OBJECT OF THE CLUB IS THE ADVANCEMENT OF THE
INTERESTS OF CANADA AND A UNITED EMPIRE

Organization of the Club and Branches

Art. 1.—(1) The organization shall be called The Empire Club of Canada.

(2) Branches of the Club may be established with the authority of the Executive Committee, and subject to such conditions and regulations as may from time to time be decided upon by the Club in Toronto.

(3) A committee may be appointed under the provisions of sub-section 2, article 1, for the establishment of branches of the Club, and the word "Unit" shall denote a Branch.

Classes of Members

Art. 2.—The Membership of the Club shall consist of

- (a) Active Resident Members,
- (b) Non-Resident Members,
- (c) Life Members,
- (d) Honorary Members,
- (e) Associate Members.

All members must be of the full age of sixteen years, and members of classes (a), (b), (c) and (d), must be British subjects.

Active Resident, Non-Resident and Associate Members

Art. 3.—(1) Candidates for Active Resident, Non-Resident and Associate Membership shall be proposed and seconded by two members of the Club in good standing, and shall be elected by a two-thirds majority of those present at any meeting of the Executive Committee.

(2) Subject to sub-section 4 of this article active resident and associate members shall pay an annual fee of

\$4.00 and non-resident memberes \$3.00, payable on the first day of October in each year in respect of the Club year from May 1 to April 30 then current. Payment of such fees shall entitle each member to receive a copy of the Year Book. No member in arrears for fees or dues shall be considered in good standing or be eligible for office.

(3) Associate members shall not have the privilege of voting or holding office.

(4) Members whose applications for membership are received after the first day of April in any year shall pay one annual fee only in respect of the period from that time till the 30th day of April in the following calendar year.

Life Members

Art. 4.—(1) Life Members, not exceeding ten in any one year, may be elected from time to time, at an open meeting of the Club, upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee. Provided, however, that Ministers of the Federal Parliament and Premiers of the different Provinces of the Dominion of Canada may be eligible for election at any time, even though their election may cause the number of Life Members to exceed ten in one year.

(2) Life Members shall pay a fee of \$50.00 in one sum.

Art. 5.—(1) Honorary Members may be elected upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee, and at a general meeting of the Club.

(2) Honorary Members shall be exempt from the payment of fees, but shall not have the privilege of voting or holding office.

Officers to be Elected

Art. 6.—(1) The officers of the Club shall consist of an Honorary President; a President; First, Second and Third Vice-President; a Treasurer, a Secretary, or a Secretary-Treasurer; the Executive Committee shall consist of these officers and 17 other members who with the officers shall be elected by ballot, and of the ex officio members hereinafter mentioned. All Past Presidents shall constitute an Advisory Council under the Chairmanship of the

immediate Past President and such ex-officio members of the Executive Committee for the ensuing year.

Election of Officers

(2) The Election of Officers of the Club shall take place at a general meeting of the members, to be held not later than April 30 of each year, at a date to be decided upon by the Executive Committee, and this meeting shall be deemed to be the Annual Meeting. The officers and Executive Committee then elected shall hold office till April 30 of the following year, and thereafter until their successors respectively have been duly elected and installed. A committee to nominate the officers for the new year shall be appointed at a regular or special meeting to be held not less than four, and not more than six weeks before such Annual Meeting, due notice of such meeting to be given to all members in good standing, and such committee shall report to the Annual Meeting; provided that no member shall be nominated to any office unless and until he has given notice in writing that he consents to such nomination and will act if elected to the position for which he has been nominated.

(3) Two Auditors shall be elected at each Annual Meeting.

Standing Committees

(4) Standing Committees shall be appointed as follows:

- (a) Finance Committee.
- (b) Speakers' Committee.
- (c) Membership Committee.
- (d) Constitution Committee.
- (e) Luncheon and Reception Committee.
- (f) Publicity Committee.
- (g) Royal Colonial Institute Committee.

Filling of Vacancies Among Officers

Art. 7.—In the event of an office becoming vacant by death, resignation, or otherwise, the vacancy thus caused

shall be filled by the Executive Committee and the person so chosen shall hold office until the next Annual Meeting.

Duties of Officers

Art. 8.—The duties of the officers shall be those customary to such positions in similar organizations.

Holding of Meetings

Art. 9.—(1) The Club shall hold general meetings weekly from October to May, both inclusive, in each twelve months with such intermission as from time to time may be decided upon.

(2) At the Annual Meeting a report of the year's proceedings and work shall be submitted by the President, and this report shall be accompanied by an interim report from the Treasurer. The Treasurer shall, in addition to the interim report presented at the Annual Meeting, present an audited statement of the finances of the Club for the full financial year at a regular meeting of the Club held during the month of May.

Notice of Meetings

Art. 10.—Written or printed notices of all meetings shall be given to the members of the Club. Such notices shall be sufficient if addressed to the members, and deposited post paid in the post office in Toronto.

Quorum at Meetings

Art. 11.—Fifteen members in good standing shall constitute a quorum at any meeting of the Club, general, annual or special and the presiding officer shall have a casting vote. Six members shall form a quorum of the Executive Committee.

Limitation of Business at General Meetings

Art. 12.—No business other than the hearing of the addresses and notices of motion shall be introduced at any meeting of the Club, unless it has been submitted to the Executive Committee and received its approval.

Calling of Special Meetings

Art. 13.—Meetings of the Executive Committee shall be called by the President, or on a requisition signed by three of its members. Special meetings of the Club may be called by the President, and shall be called by him on a requisition signed by twelve members and stating the object of the meeting. This object shall be stated in the notice calling the special meeting.

Financial Year

Art. 14.—The Financial Year of the Club shall begin on the first day of May in each year and end on the thirtieth day of April in the year following.

Amendments to Constitution

Art. 15.—This Constitution may be amended at the Annual Meeting, or at a special meeting called for that purpose, subject to a two thirds majority vote of the members present.

MEMBERS WITH HIS MAJESTY'S FORCES ON ACTIVE SERVICE

Aird, Lieut. W. H.
 Armstrong, J. S. P.
 Ashlin, C. H. N.
 Burgess, Major F. A.
 Clarkson, Major Robert C.
 Crawford-Brown, Lyman
 Crawford-Brown, Norman
 Dunlap, Lieut. D. M.
 Gibson, Col. R. B., K.C.
 Gilmour, Thos. W.
 Grasett, Lieut. S. H. B.
 Hatch, Carr
 Johnston, Erskine B.

Junkin, Major Lawrence
 Lee, Flying Officer, H. T. I.
 Massey, Squadron Ldr. Denton
 Matthews, Flight Lieut. A. Beech
 Matthews, F. B.
 Matthews, Flight Lieut. Paul W.
 Nash, Col. A. E., M.C.
 Nunn, Norman A.
 Ruttan, Lt.-Col. C. M.
 Watson, Col. W. H.

LIFE AND HONORARY MEMBERS

Bruce, Hon. Dr. Herbert A.
 Clouse, Dr. Elias
 Coombs, F. J.
 Errington, Joseph
 Fasken, Alex.
 Ferguson, Hon. G. Howard, K. C.
 Fetherstonhaugh, F. B., K.C.
 Geary, Major B. Handley, V.C.
 Gibbons, John J.
 Kernahan, W. T.

MacDougall, A. Roy
 MacKendrick, Col. W. G.
 McWhinney, W. J., K.C.
 Murdoch, Jas. Y., K.C., LL.D.
 Scythes, J. A.
 Stapells, H. G.
 Stapells, R. A.
 Stewart, J. F. M.
 Tindall, H. B.
 *Wood, E. R.

NON-RESIDENT MEMBERS

Arnoldi, Charles
 Baker, Robert P.
 Beaumont, Jos.
 Boyd, Mossom deG.
 Brace, J. H.
 Bradley, Bruce H.
 Bradley, E.
 Bradley, Howard C.
 Caulder, J. A.
 Cawthra-Elliott, Maj. Gen. H. M.
 Davis, Aubrey
 Dowding, C. E.
 Fraser, Alasdair D. R.
 Gibson, W. R.
 Hitchcock, C. H.
 Hughes, Gordon R.
 Jackson, E. H.
 Kidd, Hon. T. Ashmore
 Livingston, J. A.

Lovell, E. A.
 McBain, Alex.
 McCrear, T. Arthur
 McCulley, Joseph
 McIntosh, C. H.
 McLaughlin, Col. R. S.
 McLean, W. A.
 MacKay, G. F. A.
 Noyes, G. R. Finch
 Over, Spencer Henry
 Raven, Rev. C. C.
 Rice, H. E.
 Richardson, Dr. R. N. C.
 Shergold, Lt.-Col. C.
 Sinclair, Dr. D. J.
 Steele, C. E.
 Walker, Charles
 Whidden, Dr. Howard P.
 Wideman, Harvey

*The death of Mr. E. R. Wood took place after this book went to press.

RESIDENT MEMBERS

Abbs, Chas. E.
Adams, A. A.
Adams, G. W.
Adamson, H. R.
Agar, Norman E.
Alberts, Edgar T.
Alexander, John B.
Allen, Geo. H.
Alley, B. P.
Ambrose, J. R. W.
Anderson, Joseph
Andison, T. H.
Appleton, C. N.
Archdekin, W. O.
Archibald, Dr. T. D.
Armour, Rev. J. B. M.
Armstrong, Rev. Dr. W. L.
Ashworth, J. J.
Atkinson, Fred
Atkinson, F. L.

Babbitt, G. M.
Babbitt, G. W.
Bain, H. R.
Bainard, R. H.
Baker, Col. E. A.
Baker, E. G.
Baker, Geo. A.
Baldwin, H. A.
Balfour, Gordon B., K.C.
Ball, L. F.
Ballard, B. W.
Band, Chas. S.
Banks, E. Harold
Barber, Geo.
Barber, William
Bark, W. A.
Bastedo, Norman H.
Bate, Wm. B.
Batten, Reg. A.
Batten, W. Howard
Baxter, Major W. James
Beairsto, A. H. C.
Bealey, Ernest R.
Beardsworth, H.
Beaton, A. H.
Beatty, Dr. Hy. A.

Beatty, W.
Becker, Dr. C. W.
Begg, Herbert
Bell, Dr. W. J.
Bennett, Norman D.
Bennett, E. J.
Benson, D. F.
Berkeley, H. C.
Berkinshaw, R. C.
Bernard, M.
Best, T. Harrison
Bevan, G. H.
Bickle, E. W.
Birkenshaw, J. H.
Bishop, G.
Bishop, H. H.
Blackburn, D. D.
Blackburn, F. J.
Blackwell, Leslie E.
Bland, Rev. Salem G.
Boase, J. B.
Boddy, Henry M.
Bogert, C. A.
Bolger, H. N.
Bond, E. A.
Bond, Major F. L. C.
Bongard, Gordon R.
Bongard, R. R.
Bonnell, W. H. M.
Bourlier, H. C.
Bowman, Capt. T. E.
Boxer, Reginald N.
Boyter, J. B.
Brathwaite, F. Y. W.
Bremner, Donald G.
Brittain, Horace L.
Brockwell, Meredith
Brooke, Arthur T.
Brooks, W.
Brown, F. I.
Brown, Henry
Brown, Murray
Brown, Stuart H.
Brown, W. E.
Bryce, Very Rev. Peter, D.D.,
D.C.L.
Bryce, Robt. A.

- Bryson, R. N.
Burgess, C. H.
Burgess, John H.
Burke, E. T. C.
Burnaby, F. Harding
Burns, H. D.
Burns, Rev. Dr. R. N.
Burt, A. W.
Burton, C. L.
Burton, E. G.
Bush, Clayton E.
- Cameron, Harry
Cameron, John D.
Cameron, Capt. J. Duncan
Cameron, M. C.
Cameron, W. A.
Campbell, Andrew
Campbell, Dr. Colin A.
Campbell, E. M.
Carl, Gordon A.
Carlisle, C. H.
Carradus, Capt. H. R.
Carriere, S. W.
Carroll, Frank J.
Carruthers, Geo.
Carruthers, Geo. L.
Carson, James L.
Carthy, Dr. W. C.
Cartwright, Brig. Gen. G. S.
Cashman, P. W.
Cassidy, H. F.
Caven, Dr. W. R.
Chalmers, Floyd S.
Chalmers, Dr. Wm. L.
Charles, Leo E.
Charlesworth, Hector
Chave, B. W.
Chipman, J. H.
Chisholm, Lt.-Col. Geo. T.
Christian, D. F.
Clark, C. T.
Clark, Herbert A., K.C.
Clark, Dr. Wm. J.
Clarkson, G. T.
Cleland, Ralph H.
Cliff, Geo. J.
Clouse, F. L.
Cody, President H. J.
- Coke, Major E. F.
Colberg, A. M.
Colby, S. A.
Colebrook, H. G.
Collins, A. Barton
Comber, W. W.
Complin, Gordon
Conant, Hon. Gordon D., K.C.
Conquergood, Chas. R.
Coon, H. J.
Cork, J. Milton
Corlett, W. E.
Corrigan, Fred S.
Corson, R. R.
Cosgrave, Provost F. H.
Coste, E. F.
Cottrelle, Geo. R.
Coulter, J. E.
Coulter, Robt. W.
Coulter, W. C.
Coulter, W. Howard
Courtice, A. Roy
Coutts, Wm. E.
Cowan, N. E.
Cowan, Major R. Cecil
Craick, W. A.
Craig, T. A.
Crang, J. H.
Cranston, Robt. A.
Crawford, F. J.
Crichton, A. S.
Crockett, E.
Cross, Edward
Crossland, E. F.
Crowell, Samuel G.
Cudworth, W. O.
Cumberland, J. D. W.
- Daley, A. W.
Dallas, Rev. A. M.
Dalley, H. O.
Daly, R. O.
Dargavel, R. B.
Davidson, Jocelyn
Davies, J. E.
Davis, Bertram N.
Davis, Bruce P.
Davis, Geo. D.
Davis, R. Reade

Davis, W. H.
Deacon, Col. F. H.
Dean, W. G.
Dean, Rev. S. W.
Decker, Chester J.
Dent, Frank E.
Detweiler, W. O.
DeVries, Henry M.
Dewar, A. M.
DeWitt, Prof. N. W.
Dibblee, John
Dickey, A. J.
Dilworth, R. J.
Dilworth, W. A.
Dingle, Major Gordon R. M.
Dix, Wm. B.
Doran, F. C.
Douglas, Howard R.
Drew, Lt.-Col. Geo. A.
Duffett, Norman G.
Duncan, Jas. S.
Duncan, S. F.
Dunkelman, D.
Dunlop, R. H.
Dunn, William
Durland, D. C.
Dutton, Thomas M.
Dyke, Jas. E.
Dyment, A. E.

Eastmure, A. W.
Eaton, Col. R. Y.
Eby, H. D.
Edmonds, C. E.
Edwards, A. Geoffrey
Edwards, H. Percy
Elgie, G. C.
Elliot, B. V.
Elliott, J. A.
Ellis, C. Q.
Ellis, Matthew T.
Ellsworth, A. L.
Elton, J. O.
Ely, E. F.
Ewing, Thos. H.

Fairweather, R. H.
Falconer, H. W.
Falconer, Sir Robert

Fallis, Rev. Geo. O.
Fennell, Robert H.
Ferguson, B. H.
Ferguson, H. H.
Ferguson, H. M.
Ferguson, John
Ferguson, M.
Fessenden, C. V.
Firstbrook, Hugh M.
Fisher, D. B.
Firth, R. M.
Fitch, P. F.
Fleming, Donald M.
Fleming, G. O.
Fleming, Robert
Fletcher, S. S.
Floyd, Lyle
Flynn, J.
Forbes, Hector M.
Forrester, Wm. J.
Foster, R. Leighton, K.C.
Fox, E. D.
Frame, S. J.
Frankel, Roy H.
Fraser, John A.
Freyseng, Edward J.
Frost, Harold R.
Fry, H.
Fulford, R. T.
Fyvie, J. M.

Gaby, Dr. F. A.
Gairdner, J. A.
Gale, George C.
Gale, George T.
Gale, R. H.
Gardiner, F. C.
Gardiner, Percy R.
Garton, Geo. M.
Gaunt, J. Wm.
Gianelli, Chevalier V.
Gibson, D. H.
Gibson, Wm. Robt.
Gifford, W. M.
Gilchrist, Prof. Lachlan
Gilchrist, T. S.
Giles, T. S. H.
Gillespie, James
Gilmour, A. H.

Glennie, Geo. H.
Glenwright, John W.
Goddard, Eric
Goggin, Victor T.
Goldberg, A. M. P.
Gooderham, E. D.
Gooderham, Geo. H.
Gooderham, M. Ross, K.C.
Gooding, T. W.
Gordon, A. B.
Gordon, T. A.
Gordon, Hon. W. A.
Gordon, Wm. E.
Gould, J. Lyall S.
Gowdy, D. M.
Grand, Percy F.
Grant, Alex. C.
Grant, F. W.
Grant, W. G. F.
Greaves, J. B.
Green, W. Edward
Greeniaus, H. A.
Gresham, G. E.
Grier, A. Monro, K.C.
Grier, Sir Wylly
Grieve, John
Griffiths, F. D.
Guest, A. E.
Gullen, Dr. J. B.
Gully, Harold M.
Gundy, C. L.
Gundy, J. H.
Gunn, Edmond
Gunn, Major General John A.

Hair, Dr. C. H.
Hall, I. C.
Hallman, Ivan
Ham, C. N.
Hambly, George
Hamilton, A. E.
Hamilton, C. S.
Hamilton, John
Hamlin, Dr. Fred V.
Hammell, J. E.
Hanna, Wm. B.
Hanson, James M.
Harcourt, R. M.
Hardy, George

Hardy, H. R.
Hargraft, Geo. N.
Hargraft, W. M.
Harpham, Cecil
Harpham, Horace
Harris, Jos. H.
Harton, E. Douglas
Harvey, E. J.
Harvey, Dr. W. J.
Hastings, C. E.
Hastings, Warren B.
Hawke, Eugene
Hawkins, V. S. G.
Hay, Frank
Hay, Ruthven
Hay, William G.
Hayden, Salter A.
Hearst, Sir Wm.
Heintzman, Charles T.
Heintzman, G. B.
Heintzman, Geo. C.
Henderson, Robert
Hendricks, J. E.
Hengstler, H. C.
Henry, Hon. G. S.
Herbinson, Wm.
Herington, Gordon
Hermant, Percy
Herod, Wesley J.
Heron, T. Earl
Hethrington, Major E. A.
Hewetson, H. H.
Hewson, E. G.
Higgins, Fred Page
Hill, F. W. J.
Hill, Roy C.
Hills, Rev. William
Hinder, Paul Gibson
Hoadley, Hon. Geo.
Hobkirk, John F.
Hoblitzell, Fred G.
Hogarth, D. M.
Hogg, Dr. T. H.
Holliss, J. F.
Hollyman, F. K.
Holmested, G. S.
Honan, James
Hookway, C. W.

- Hooper, Col. B. O., D.S.O., M.C.
 Hopkins, Howard
 Hopkins, Oliver B.
 Hopkins, Percy E.
 Hotrum, Fredk.
 Houghton, E. O.
 Houston, H. C.
 Howard, Clifford H.
 Howe, C. D.
 Howe, H. J.
 Howse, Thos. H.
 Huckvale, Robert
 Huffman, Geo. E.
 Hugill, Albert E.
 Hugill, W. M.
 Hulbig, F. M.
 Humphrey, H. J.
 Humphrey, Dr. John N.
 Humphreys, W. Eason
 Hunt, A. T.
 Hunt, John F.
 Hunter, B. B.
 Hunter, Lt.-Col. F. Fraser
 Hunter, H. T.
 Hunter, K. M.
 Huston, B. T.
 Huston, J. A.
 Hutchison, O. A.
 Hyland, Jas. A.
 Ingram, H. S.
 Innes, Rev. T. Christie, M.A.
 Irwin, John C. W.
 Jacklin, T. W.
 Jackman, H. R.
 Jacob, E. R.
 Jaffray, W. G.
 James, H. C.
 Jamieson, H. T.
 Jamieson, John D.
 Jarvis, H. St. J.
 Jarvis, Norman S.
 Jeffers, Wellington J.
 Jeffrey, T. G.
 Jennings, P. H.
 Jephcott, Dr. C. M.
 Jephcott, Gerald
 Jerry, Carman A.
 Johnson, D. O.
 Johnson, John
 Johnston, Lt.-Col. Baptist
 Johnston, Dr. Samuel
 Jolliffe, W. H.
 Jones, G. J. L.
 Jones, J. Erle
 Jones, T. Roy
 Keith, Gordon C.
 Kellam, Geo. M.
 Kellow, Ralph S.
 Kemp, W. H.
 Kennedy, J. deN.
 Kennedy, Col. Thos. L.
 Kent, Herbert B.
 Kerr, Halbert J.
 Kerr, John E.
 Kerr, Rev. J. McD.
 Keys, Norman A., K.C.
 Kilgour, R. C.
 King, E. W.
 Kinghorn, A. A.
 Kingsland, W. A.
 Kingsmill, Col. W. B.
 Kinnear, T. Clark
 Kinsman, J. Victor
 Kirkpatrick, Col. A. E.
 Kirkpatrick, A. M. M.
 Kirkpatrick, W. R.
 Kirschmann, A. N.
 Kitchen, Dr. Irving D.
 Kitchen, Walter
 Knight, Cyril W.
 Knowlton, Thos. E.
 LaBine, Chas.
 Lamb, Col. H. J.
 Lamb, John R.
 Lamont, W. H.
 Lang, James
 Laughton, H. V.
 Lavine, Arthur
 Lawer, W. L.
 Lawson, Frank G.
 Lea, Herbert
 Leacock, Geo. D.
 Ledger, W. R.

Lee, Charles E.
 Leetham, Geo. E.
 Leibel, Wm.
 Lemon, W. E.
 Lennie, E. D.
 Leonard, T. D'Arcy
 Leslie, Rodger
 LeSueur, R. V.
 Levey, L. E.
 Lindsay, G. C.
 Lindsay, W. W.
 Linnell, A. P.
 Lister, M. Parker
 Lithgow, J. H.
 Little, Wm.
 Littlefield, Frank H.
 Lloyd, David S.
 Lloyd, T. E.
 Logan, C. S.
 Logan, S. H.
 Lord, R. W.
 Lount, H. M.
 Love, Harry H.
 Lovering, His Honor Judge
 Egerton
 Loveys, Geo. C.
 Lucas, F. O.
 Luxton, Rev. Geo. N.

McAdam, S.
 McBride, James
 McCarthy, Leighton
 McCarthy, Leigh M.
 McCauley, Roy E.
 McClatchie, John
 McClelland, D. McK.
 McCloskey, H. C.
 McColl, D. A.
 McCollum, Dr. J. A.
 McCoy, G. E.
 McCraw, D. F.
 McCrea, Hon. Chas.
 McCrimmon, D. A.
 McCulloch, Dr. R. J. P.
 McDermott, Francis S.
 McDonagh, Dr. A. J.
 McDougall, R. G. M.
 McDowell, George
 McFarlane, J. R.
 McGaw, T. D.

McGillivray, Dr. Donald
 McGillivray, T. A.
 McGinnis, S. L.
 McIntosh, A. N.
 McIntyre, K.
 McKee, John W.
 McKerrow, J. O.
 McKinley, Dr. J. M.
 McKinnon, W. L.
 McLaren, J. B.
 McLean, J. S.
 McLeod, D. I.
 McLeod, J. A.
 McLeod, W. N.
 McMaster, T. G.
 McMillan, Norman
 McMillen, John B.
 McMullen, Robert
 McMurray, Leonard L.
 McNamara, George A.
 McNeill, E. W.
 McNeil, J. A.
 McNeillie, Geo. G.
 McPherson, R. S.
 McWilliams, D. B.
 Macaulay, Hon. Leopold
 MacBeth, John C. M., K.C.
 MacBrien, W. A. H.
 MacDiarmid, H.
 MacDonald, Charleton E.
 Macdonald, C. S.
 MacFadyen, W. T. A.
 MacKay, Hon. Mr. Justice J.
 Keiller
 MacKelcan, Fred R.
 Mackellar, S. R.
 MacKenzie, D. R.
 Mackey, Wallace A.
 MacKinnon, J. Bruce
 MacLachlan, Wills
 McLaren, Ian
 MacLean, Major Hugh C.
 MacLean, Lt.-Col. J. B.
 MacLeod, J. K.
 MacLeod, Rev. Ronald
 MacMillan, George A.
 MacMillan, Dr. R. J.
 Macrae, A. Montye
 Macrae, E. M.
 Malcolm, J. L.

Malcolmson, H. A.
Mallison, Fred
Mancantelli, Robert
Manning, H. B.
Marsh, F. Hedley
Marsh, W. H.
Marshall, Col. K. R.
Martin, H. J.
Martin, J. H.
Martin, S. O.
Martyn, Howe
Massey, F. Vernon
Massie, R. H. L.
Matthews, Arnold C.
Matthews, Donald
Matthews, James G.
Matthews, Hon. R. C.
Maunsell, J. Q.
Maxwell, John
May, George E. I.
Medland, Gordon
Medland, T. J.
Meech, R. G., K.C.
Menzies, Thomas E.
Meredith, Arthur
Meredith, C. H.
Merrick, D. A. Y.
Mess, Lt.-Col. James
Middleton, A. N.
Miles, Arthur W.
Millar, J. C.
Millar, W. E.
Miller, Andrew
Miller, Chas. T.
Miller, P. C.
Mitchell, A. N.
Mitchell, B. L.
Mitchell, Brig. Gen. C. H.
Mitchell, C. S. F.
Mitchell, Dr. E. W.
Mitchell, Dr. J. P.
Mitchell, Osborne
Mitchell, Wm. G.
Mitchell, Lt.-Col. W. G.
Moffat, D. R.
Moncur, W. L.
Monypenny, T. F.
Moore, Elwin M.
Moore, F.
Moore, H. Napier

Moore, R. C.
Moore, S. J.
Morgan, J.
Morgan, Marcel T.
Morley, Frank
Morley, R. B.
Morris, Alex. C.
Morrison, L. S.
Morrow, F. K.
Morrow, Capt. Graham
Morrow, G. A.
Moysey, Arthur E.
Muir, A. K.
Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.
Mulock, Col. The Hon. W. P.
Mulqueen, F. J.
Munn, Chas. H.
Munnoch, Gordon R.
Muntz, G. H.
Murphy, Edward J.
Murphy, J. A.
Murphy, M. P.
Murray, H. W.
Muskett, Donald T.
Muskett, H. W.
Musson, C. J.
Mutch, S. M.

Nash, Gerald
Naylor, W. W.
Needham, C. F.
Neelands, E. V.
Neilly, Balmer
Ness, W. Robt. M.
New, Ryland H.
Newman, Harry A.
Newport, W. R.
Newth, Reg. W.
Newton, B. G.
Nicholson, H. A.
Nicholson, James
Nimmo, Bruce D.
Noble, Wilfred G.
Northey, R. K.
Northway, A. G.
Norton, T. W. F.
Nunn, J. Edwin

O'Brien, G. E.
O'Connor, W. M.

- Olver, Lt-Col. E. A., D.S.O.,
V.D.
Ongley, David J.
Ormsby, R. P.
Osborne, Col. J. Ewart
Osler, F. G.
Osler, Glyn
Ostrom, W. R.
Owen, Most Rev. Derwyn T.
Owens, C. L.
- Page, Wm. A.
Pakes, S. A.
Palmer, H. A.
Parker, Dr. Chas. B.
Parker, Very Rev. Stuart C.,
D.D.
Parkinson, N. F.
Partridge, A. G.
Patrick, W. G.
Patterson, H. F.
Patterson, J. P.
Patterson, J. K.
Patterson, R. E.
Pattinson, R. B.
Pearce, C. T.
Pearce, N. C.
Pearce, R. John
Peckover, Cecil R.
Pepall, Geo. T.
Perry, Geo. D.
Perry, Gordon F.
Perry, H. M.
Perry, N. R.
Pettipiere, R.
Pettit, Godfrey S.
Phipps, A. E.
Phoenix, C. S.
Pierdon, Wm. G.
Pike, Theodore
Pipe, C. S.
Plant, W. H.
Plantner, J. F.
Pogue, Frank L.
Porter, D. H.
Porter, F. R.
Porter, Dr. Geo. D.
Potter, Chas. Ed.
Poucher, F. B.
Powell, H. F.
- Powley, J.
Pratt, J. P., K.C.
Prentice, Magistrate John L.
Prentice, Victor F.
Proverbs, C. I.
Price, Lt.-Col. W. H.
Pringle, J. F.
Pugsley, T. Aubrey
Pullan, Harry
Pullen, Frank
Purvis, Maxwell C., K.C.
- Rae, Robert
Ransom, A. C.
Rankin, Donald O., B.A.
Rawlinson, Lt-Col. Walter
Reburn, E. T.
Reburn, H.
Reed, Col. LeGrand
Reeve, P. B.
Reid, Fraser D.
Reid, Loftus H.
Reid, Dr. Spence
Renison, Bishop R. J.
Rennie, Thos.
Ridout, G. L.
Riley, Very Rev. Dean
Ringland, H. S.
Ripley, Col. Blair
Ripley, Bruce T.
Roberts, Major A. Kelso
Roberts, Sir Chas. G. D.
Roberts, C. Percy
Roberts, F. E.
Roberts, H. A. D.
Robertson, A. Ross
Robertson, Major Chas. A.
Robertson, C. S.
Robertson, Douglas S.
Robertson, R. A.
Robertson, W. G.
Robinson, G. G.
Robinson, W. W.
Roewade, O.
Rogerson, J. G.
Rollason, W. E.
Rolph, F. A.
Rolph, F. Grenville
Romer, Norman R.
Rooney, J. H.

Rose, F. W.
Ross, Bruce D.
Ross, J. D. F.
Ross, Hon. W. D.
Routley, Lt.-Col. F. S.
Routley, Dr. F. W.
Rowan, Donald H.
Rowell, Hon. N. W., K.C.
Rowland, John A.
Rowland, W. Alex.
Rowley, Col. C. W.
Ruddy, E. L.
Ruddy, Robt.

St. Lawrence, F.
Sachs, Rabbi Samuel
Salter, W. R.
Samuel, Sigmund
Sanderson, C. R.
Sandham, E. A.
Sandwell, B. K.
Sargeant, E. S.
Saunders, E. M.
Saunders, S. J. Reginald
Sawers, Rev. Canon F. J.
Scheuer, Edmund
Scheuer, Edmund Jr.
Scheuer, Isadore S.
Schurman, C. D.
Scott, John R.
Scott, S. C.
Scott, W. S.
Scroggie, Geo. E.
Seagram, J. S.
Sedgwick, Harry
Sedgwick, Joseph
Sedgewick, Kenneth
Selby, Reginald
Selby, W. T. H.
Sexsmith, J. Alex.
Shakespeare, Wm. C.
Shapley, W. H.
Sharp, Dr. Fletcher
Shaver, Edward B. H.
Shenstone, Dr. Norman
Shields, C. B.
Shier, Dr. R. V. B.
Shortt, Maurice J.
Sibbald, S. J.

Sifton, Major Clifford
Simpson, James I.
Sinclair, Neil, K.C.
Singer, J. G.
Smallpeice, V. N.
Smith, A. Bayard
Smith, A. L.
Smith, Charles M.
Smith, Dr. David King
Smith, F. D. L.
Smith, Major Howell
Smith, H. M.
Smith, Irving D.
Smith, Paul L.
Smith, Reid J.
Smith, V. R.
Snider, C. H. J.
Snively, Major A. C.
Sommerville, Norman, K.C.
Sommerville, Wm. E.
Southall, H. L.
Speight, T. B.
Spence, John D., K.C.
Spence, Dr. R. J.
Springett, Rev. E. J.
Stanley, J. N.
Stanley, R. D.
Stanley, Richard T.
Stephenson, H. R.
Stevenson, H. H.
Stewart, Dr. A. E.
Stewart, Alan E.
Stewart, Dunlop
Stewart, E. E.
Stewart, R. T.
Stewart, Wm. J., O.B.E.
Stickney, M. R.
Stodart, A. B.
Stoddart, W. H.
Stubington, Geoffrey
Summers, G. F.
Suydam, J. C.

Taylor, Donald
Taylor, E. Geo. T.
Taylor, E. P.
Taylor, J. G.
Taylor, N. H.
Taylor, Reginald W.

Tedman, Harry M.
Thom, Kenneth
Thompson, E. F.
Thompson, Geo. W.
Thompson, Gordon V.
Thompson, Harry T.
Thompson, J. W., K.C.
Thomson, Prof. Ellis
Thomson, H. G.
Tidy, Major Frank O.
Tinning, Stanley E.
Tolchard, F. D.
Tory, John A.
Trow, Dr. E. J.
Tucker, Edward J.
Tudhope, H. R.
Turner, E. H.
Turner, James
Tuteur, M. P.
Tutte, Lt.-Col. H. C.
Tyrell, E. C.
Tyrell, H. V.
Tyrell, Wm.

Urquhart, Norman C.

VanKoughnet, Arthur
Van Lane, J. F.
Van Nostrand, C. I.
Vanstone, B. S.
Vaughan, J. J.
Venables, Francis G.
Verral, Geo. W.
Virtue, Roy A.
Von Maur, Jacob D.

Waldie, R. S.
Walker, Aitken
Walker, E. B.
Walker, H. C.
Walker, Wm.
Wallace, H. LeRoy
Walmsley, Joseph
Walsh, Fred T.
Walters, Chester
Ward, Rev. James E.
Wardlaw, J. W.
Wardlaw, T. D.
Warren, Dr. C. A.

Warren, Harold D.
Warwick, Geo. R.
Warwick, R. D.
Waters, W. Keith
Watson, George E.
Watson, W. G.
Watson, Dr. W. V.
Wegenast, F. W., K.C.
Welch, Frank
Wells, E. F.
Weston, J. F.
Westren, John
Westwood, Harry N.
Wheatley, E.
Wheelwright, Barton
White, Sir Thos.
Whitehead, J. H.
Whiteley, J.
Whittemore, F. Cooper
Whittingham, Major H.
Wildblood, G. W.
Wilkes, F. Hilton
Williams, A. W.
Williams, B. H.
Williams, H. H.
Williams, Dr. J. J.
Wilkinson, E. H.
Willinsky, Dr. A. I.
Wilson, A. E.
Wilson, Alex.
Wilson, Geo.
Wilson, G. D.
Winchell, L. F.
Winter, L. A.
Wolfenden, Hugh H.
Wood, F. P.
Wood, L. M.
Woodcock, Rev. Canon H. F. D.
Woods, Q. C.
Wright, E. Frank
Wright, L. V.
Wyatt H. L.

Young, H. G.
Young, John A.
Young, W. T.

Zinkan, Dr. E. I.

